

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1850.

VOL. II.—NO. I.

THE NEW CREATION IN CHRIST.

THERE are many valuable thoughts in the article of Prof. Schaff, though some of his declarations seem to us to savor of the transcendental. The affirmation he makes that "the Lord is perpetually born anew in the hearts of believers," sounds strangely to our ears. That his image is created there is indeed true, but that the Lord is born there, is not the teaching of the Bible. Again: "The *commencement*," he says, "of Church History, is strictly the incarnation of the Son of God, or the entrance of the new principle of light and life into humanity." The incarnation of the Son of God is plain enough, but what is this "new principle of light and life?" And what "new principle" has there been in humanity since the incarnation, that was not in it before that event.—*N. Y. Observer*, Sept. 8, 1848.

THIS paragraph occurs in a short notice of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for August, the first article of which is a masterly Introduction to Church History from Prof. Schaff. It is significantly characteristic of the system of thinking it represents, and furnishes fit occasion, in such view, for a few remarks.

Here is some approach to a determination of what we are to understand by that most ambiguous term "*transcendentalism*," in the popular vocabulary. It savors of the transcendental, we are told, to say that "the Lord is perpetually born anew in the hearts of believers," or that the mystery of the incarnation in-

VOL. II.—NO. I.

*1

volves "the entrance of a new principle of light and life into humanity." Very well. Let us now look a little into the matter.

The first expression, says the critic, sounds strangely in our ears. The *image* of Christ is created in the hearts of believers, but not the Lord himself, according to the Bible. The image of Christ, then, as formed in believers, is something quite distinct, in the mind of the critic, from the living substance of Christ himself. It bears merely an outward resemblance to him, under a wholly independent form of being; it is the picture morally of his holy mind and character, but carries in it no participation whatever in his very nature. It is related to him, not as the branch to the vine, but only as a mechanical transcript or copy to the original object it is employed to represent. Christ stands in the world solitary and alone. He has made it possible, however, for men to obtain forgiveness with God, and then to be formed by the Holy Ghost and their own endeavors into a new religious life, the type of which is set before them in his person as an outward model. This process involves a new creation; for it is wrought in part, at least, by the creative *fiat* of God's Spirit; but in the end, it is a new creation that belongs in an immediate and exclusive way, to each single believer for himself. It is no reproduction in him of the new creation already at hand in Christ; the Spirit calls into being within him, not the force of what is in Christ himself fontally for the salvation of the world, but the image or picture of this, simply under another form. This, we say, seems to be the meaning which underlies the criticism here in view. The opposite idea, which makes the new life in believers to hold in organic continuity with Christ's life, is set down as transcendentalism. To make it an abstraction, a thing of sheer thought, an abruptly miraculous *image*, is counted to be common sense; and the Bible, we are gravely assured, teaches no other view.

Thus it is that the school here represented, is ever ready to run away with the Bible, in a wholesale way, as though it must of necessity be all on their side, just because with their *preconceived system of thought* it carries to themselves such sense and no other. Multitudes, in all ages, have read the sense of the Bible differently; but that weighs nothing with this school; no judgment is allowed to be of any force, in the case, against its own. "This is not the teaching of the Bible," cries the infallible critic; as though *his* dictum in such style must end the matter; and there it is made to stop. We should have been glad to see something more, in this line of argument, a true appeal to the sacred oracles themselves. The subject is certainly deserving of such attention. It goes to the very foundation of Christianity. Is it

a doctrine only or a fact? Is it a new creation in Christ, or is it a divinely wrought image of that only *out of Christ*? The question is worthy of something more than a magisterial wave of the hand, after the summary fashion of the criticism here in view.

The Bible as *we* read it, and as it has been read by millions of God's saints from the beginning, and we will add too, according to the most profoundly scientific exegesis of the present time, *does* teach broadly and clearly the very mystery which this critic proclaims to be transcendentalism, sounding strangely to his ears. The charge of disregarding it falls of right on himself and his widely influential school, and not on Professor Schaff. Has he never read the Gospel of St. John, in which, according to the judgment of the universal Church, the inmost and deepest sense of Christianity is revealed, and by which, accordingly, all the other Gospels are to be explained and made complete? Could it well be more explicitly affirmed, than it is here affirmed in fact, in the very beginning of this Gospel, that it is the *Life* of the Word which is the source of light and salvation to men, and that the Word became flesh to make room for its actual entrance into our fallen nature, as the fountain of a new creation? "Of his *fullness* have all we received" (John i. 16). We become sons of God, by union with him in a supernatural way. Let Christ be apprehended as the central bearer of the new creation, whose universal *fullness* is made to reach over in the form of grace and truth, (not law but life,) into the souls of his people, and the sublime representation of St. John is simple and clear. Resolve the Christian salvation into an outward image only of Christ, wrought either with or without God's help, and the representation is blind as chaos. The beginning of the Gospel, too, is only in harmony with the idea that fills it throughout. It is not only a text or two, here and there, that admits the sense now urged, by violent and doubtful construction. Such men as Ols hausen and Tholuck, find this sense in every chapter; and it is only by the most forced and unnatural exegesis, that commentators of the Rationalistic school have been able at all to keep it out of sight. Everywhere Christ speaks of himself, or is regarded by the sacred writer, as the living fountain of the salvation he reveals. He is the resurrection and the life. To have the Son, is to have life. The sixth chapter is as strong as words can make it, in asserting the real participation of believers in the life of Christ. Except we eat his flesh, and drink his blood, we have no life; this involves eternal life, and a resurrection at the last day; it is to dwell in Christ, and have him dwell in us; to live by him, as *he* lives by or from the Father (John vi. 53-58.)

Is this simply to have his *image* formed in us, as something in no organic connection with his person? And what shall we say of his own beautiful emblem of the vine and its branches, employed John xv. 1-8, to represent this mystical union? Is the life of the vine not also the life of its branch? Is the last only *like* the first, a picture of it under a wholly separate form? Could any representation more forcibly show, that "the Lord is perpetually born anew in the hearts of believers," that his life is reproduced in their life, that their formation into his image involves an inward adoration also into the very substance of his mediatorial person? We might refer also to the startling language employed on this subject in his last prayer, John xvii. 21-23; but we forbear.

Nor is this view of the new life confined to St. John. It comes before us also in the more dialectical thinking of St. Paul. No idea is more familiar with him, than that by which Christ and his people are regarded as being joined together in the power of a common life; which, as such, of course, starts from him as its source, and is carried over to them by real organic derivation. He is the head, and they are the members, of the same mystical body. This image is ever at hand in his mind, to express their union. Can it possibly mean less than an actual participation of one side, in the living substance of the other? In this character of Christ's body, the Church is declared to be "the fullness of him that filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 23); which plainly signifies something far more than an outward merely moral relationship, however strict and close. Everywhere again, and under all varieties of expression, believers are spoken of as being *in Christ*. One or two instances of such language might bear, possibly, to be resolved into a strong figure of speech; although we should feel it a strange hyperbole, indeed, to speak even twice or once of the patriots of the American Revolution, as being *in General Washington*. But in the case before us, the instances are not one or two only; we meet them on every page; the very frequency and familiarity of their occurrence, serves to blind us to the true and proper force of the phraseology. The foundation of the phraseology with St. Paul, and the sacred writers generally, is beyond all doubt the sense of such a union between Christ and his people, as actually inserts them spiritually into the substance of his life. They are a new creation (*καὶ νέα τεκτονία*, II. Cor. v. 17,) in Christ Jesus; not a new creation out of him and beyond him, by the fiat of omnipotence, bearing some resemblance to him in a wholly different sphere; but a new creation, whose original seat and fountain is Christ's own person, and which conveys over to them, accordingly, with true reproductive force, the vitality which belongs to it in this form. This does not imply that the believer can be all that Christ is; much less

that he can be thus complete in any separate view. Christ is the central person, in whom is the fullness of life for the whole world; his people are made complete only by being comprehended relatively in this fullness; as all the other points of a circle are made what they are, by real dependence on the centre of it, and not by bringing the centre, as such, over into themselves. The union here, is indeed spiritual; it is wrought by the Holy Ghost; but the realness and inwardness of it are, on this account, only the more sure. It is the spiritual being of the believer, his personality, his intelligence and will, (which in the end, however, must determine the quality of the entire man,) that are poised on Christ as a perpetual living centre. "Christ liveth in me," says Paul, "and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me" (Gal. ii. 20). "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are *complete in him*" Col. ii. 9, 10; your life, in other words, is made perfect, finds its true end and sense, in union with him, as the universal centre of the vast spiritual organism of Christianity. It is, in truth, Christ's *image*, that is formed in the souls of his people; but not a dead image; not an outward image; not such an image as is cut off in full from the object it represents, and comes before us as a quite different thing. It is "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. i. 27); Christ, who is our life" (Col. iii. 4); Christ that dwells in our hearts by faith (Eph. iii. 17); Christ formed with birth travail into our persons, (ἀπειποντος ἐν μορφωσί, Χριστὸς ἐν νόμῳ, Gal. iv. 19); the very thought which the critic of the New York Observer pronounces transcendentalism sounding strangely to his ears. The image of Christ thus born into his people, is like that of the vine in its branches, the power of his own life continuing itself over organically into their persons. He is the beginning of the new creation, the first-born from the dead; not as the outward cause of it simply, or its outward model; but as its principle and fonsal spring; the whole flows forth really from his person (Cor. i. 15-18). Thus it is, that his life repeats itself in believers; their salvation is carried forward by a mystical reproduction in them of the grand facts of his history; he is born in them, suffers in them, dies in them, rises in them from the dead, and ascends in them to the right hand of God in heaven. This bold thought, as we all know, abounds in all Paul's writings. Our baptism buries us into Christ's death; our old man is crucified with him; we are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead (Rom. vi. 4-6; Col. ii. 12, 13). The sufferings of believers are the sufferings of Christ; they fill up that which is behind

of these last, carry onward the sense and value of them in the world, for the sake of his body, the Church (2 Cor. i. 5; iv. 10, 11; Phil. iii. 10; Col. i. 24). In virtue of the living bond, which unites the members with the head, even that which is still future in their case, is at times spoken of as past; they are not only called and justified, but are glorified also in Christ, as potentially secure of all that is comprised in his resurrection (Rom. viii. 29, 30). They are quickened, raised up, and made to sit together with him in heavenly places (Eph. ii. 5, 6). Their citizenship is in heaven; their life hid with Christ in God, and destined by its full relation hereafter, to change even their present vile bodies into the glorious image of his own (Phil. iii. 20, 21; Col. iii. 3, 4). His spirit dwelling in them now, shall in due time quicken even their mortal bodies into immortality (Rom. viii. 11). His resurrection is the guaranty and pledge of theirs, works itself out to its last result only in their recovery from the grave (Rom. viii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 20-23, 45-49; 1 Thess. iv. 14).

But why should we go on to multiply proofs in this way, for what no unsophisticated reader of the New Testament surely will pretend to deny? What can the New Testament be said to teach at all, if it do not teach the fact of the mystical union, the true and actual formation of Christ's life into the souls of his people? Men may get rid of this teaching, if they choose, by wilfully turning the whole of it into barren metaphor and figure. But it is with a very bad grace they then turn round and say: *We go by the Bible.* The same system of interpretation, with less than half the same trouble, might set aside every text that is usually quoted in favor of the Trinity. The question of election, the question of the perseverance of the saints, and many other questions made to be of primary account in one orthodox system or another, are of far less clear representation in the Bible, than this view of the Christian salvation, as involving "Christ in us the hope of glory." Nor is it, by any means, of new acknowledgment in the Church, however strange and transcendental it may now sound to *some* "evangelical" ears. It runs through the universal theology of the old Christian Fathers. It forms the key-note to the deepest piety of the Middle Ages. It animates the faith of all the Reformers. Luther and Calvin both proclaim it, in terms that should put to shame the rationalism of later times, pretending to follow them, and yet casting the mystery to the winds.

We pass on to the second point, presented in this criticism. The incarnation, we are told, is plain enough; but the critic is at a loss to make anything out of the "new principle of light and life," which it is supposed to introduce into humanity; and

asks, what new principle has been in it *since* the incarnation, which was not in it *before*.

His own idea of the incarnation is, plainly, that it did not enter into the organization of the world at all, as a fact of permanent force. Probably he has no sense whatever of this organization, as a vast whole completing itself in man, and thus reaching forward as a single historical process from the beginning of the world to its end. *This* too, he would take to "savor of the transcendental." The world is for him neither organism nor history, but a vast sand-heap, in which men are thrown together outwardly, to be formed for eternity as so many separate units, each perfect and complete by itself. The incarnation, of course, in such view, becomes one of these naked units only, the man Jesus mysteriously made God for himself alone, an abstraction that comes into no real connection with our general humanity beyond the limits of his person. He stands in the world a mere theophany; not of a few hours only, as in the days of Abraham, but of thirty-three years; a sublime avatar, fantastically paraded thus long before men's eyes, only to be translated afterwards to heaven, and continued there, (for the imagination,) in no real union with the world's life whatever. This, thus left behind by the transient apparition, pursues precisely its old course, including in its living stream nothing more than has belonged to it from the beginning. The incarnation, under such Gnostic view, is taken to be "plain enough;" while to conceive of it as a new principle of light and life for the world, seems a flight clear over the horizon of common sense.

But now, in the full face again of all this abstract thinking, we affirm that it finds no countenance or support whatever in the Bible. According to the first chapter of Genesis, the world is an organic whole, which completes itself in man; and humanity is regarded throughout as a single grand fact, which is brought to pass, not at once, but in the way of history, unfolding always more and more its true interior sense, and reaching onward towards its final consummation. The Jewish dispensation had respect to the wants of the universal world, and was intended from the beginning, to make room for the coming of Christ; which took place, accordingly, at last, when the "fullness of the time was come," (Gal. iv. 4,) "in the wisdom of God," (1 Cor. i. 21,) and "according to the riches of his grace, wherein he hath abounded, toward us in all wisdom and prudence" (Eph. i. 7-10). The incarnation, in this view, was no passing theophany or avatar. It was the form, in which the sense of all previous history came finally to its magnificent outlet. This outlet, however, when it did come, involved a great deal more than was comprehended

in the actual constitution of the world, the living human world, as it stood before; for it was brought to pass by the real union of the everlasting Word with our fallen life. The mystery of the incarnation had been coming through four thousand years; still the *coming* was not the presence of the fact itself; as little as the aurora which gilds the eastern heavens may be taken for the full orb'd splendors of the risen sun. Christ is the sense of all previous history, the grand terminus towards which it was urged from the beginning; while in this very character, at the same time, he brings into union with it a new divine force, which was not in it before, though required from the first to make it complete. He is the true basis thus of the period going before, as well as of the period that follows. Two conceptions, in this way, enter jointly into the idea of the incarnation, as it challenges our faith throughout the New Testament. First, it is a fact which unites itself really with the living constitution, the actual concrete and organic history, of the world, as it existed previously; it was no phantasm, no spectrum, no abstract symbol only played off to the eyes of men supernaturally for the space of thirty-three years. Secondly, however, it is in this form a new creation; not the continuation simply of the old, but the introduction into this of a higher life, (the Word made flesh,) which all its powers, as they stood previously, were inadequate to reach. Can there be any doubt, in regard to the scriptural authority of *both* these conceptions? They form the poles of the universal christian consciousness, as it starts in the Apostles' Creed. They rule the whole process of theology in the Church, from the beginning, in opposition to Gnostic supernaturalism on the one hand, and Ebionitic naturalism on the other. Both are presented to us from every page of the New Testament. Christianity, shorn of either, falls at once to the ground. To make Christ an intrinsic result simply, or an extrinsic accident only, for the old creation, is to go full in the face of the whole Bible. He *must* be all or nothing here; the deepest and most central fact of the world, or no fact at all; the alpha and omega of humanity, or no part of humanity whatever.

To say that no "new principle of light and life" was introduced into the world by the incarnation, that the world carried in its constitution, before Christ came, all that is carried in it since, is virtually to deny the incarnation altogether; for it overthrows the historical centrality of the fact, and, indeed, thrusts it quite out of the process of history. The fact, in this view, ceases to be *immanent* to the economy of our universal human life, lies on the outside of it, comes to no real union with it in any way. Surely this is not Christianity. The Word, eternally with the Father, says John, became flesh in Christ, and so joined itself

through him with our fallen nature. This he holds to be plainly the Fact of all facts, the *cardo* of the world's life, the pillar that upholds at last the entire sense of the moral universe. "The law came by Moses; but grace and truth by Jesus Christ." I baptize you, cries the Baptist, (himself greater than all the Old Testament prophets, and yet less than the least in the kingdom of heaven, Math. xi. 11,) with water only; he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire. So Christ himself everywhere claims to be, not the oracle simply of truth and life in force before, but the *principle* of truth and life made real for the world wholly and only by himself. The Spirit fell upon him, at his baptism, in full measure, to find way through him and from him subsequently to the whole family of the redeemed (Math. iii. 16; John vii. 39; Acts i. 4, 5; ii. 1-4). He is the organ of living communication between earth and heaven, the central point where they are first fairly united into one (John i. 51). He is the real presence in the world, of what had been proclaimed before in the way of shadow only and word (John i. 18; Math. v. 17, 18; Heb. ix. 8-12, &c., &c.). He is no moon merely to reflect, like the prophets before him, a simply borrowed light, but according to his own word, the very sun of the spiritual world, (John viii. 12,) and so, of course, a fountain and principle of light for it in his own person. He is the well of salvation, (John iv. 14; vii. 37, 38,) the manna of immortality, (John vi. 49-51,) the victory itself in which is swallowed up all the power of the grave (John v. 21-25; xi. 25, 26). He is the principle thus of *life*, as well as of light; the one indeed involving the other. He hath life *in himself*, fontally, (John v. 26,) for the use of the world. His life is the light of men (John i. 4). A new order of things is proclaimed, as coming into force especially with his resurrection and glorification. Cast into the ground, he becomes the seed of a vast harvest (John, xii. 24). Lifted up from the earth, he is the nucleus of a new humanity (John xii. 32). His entrance into glory opens the windows of heaven and allows free egress for the powers of his own higher life to go forth into the general stream of human history, by the Church, as never in all ages before (John vii. 39; Mark xvi. 15-18; John xiv. 16-20, &c., &c.).

Need we say, that Paul again abounds everywhere with the same thought, in his own way? Beyond all question, *he* saw in Christ a new principle of light and life for the human race. In no other view, is his language at all intelligible. Christ is for him the "second Adam," more intimately related to the race, as its base and centre, than the first (Rom. v. 12-15; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45-49). He is in this character a "quickenning spirit (πνεῦ-

$\mu\alpha\zeta\omega\pi\alpha\iota\omega\bar{\nu}\nu$); second in order of time, but first in the depth and inwardness of his representative life. He is the great mystery of humanity, hid from ages and from generations, but at last made manifest to his saints (Col. i. 26, 27); "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, God might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth" (Eph. i. 9, 10); "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. iii. 9, 10). He is our peace; the medium of our reconciliation with God; the source thus of a new order of consciousness, in which all previous antagonisms are brought to an end (Eph. ii. 14-22). He is the universal solvent, through whose force the elements of the ethical world are subdued and constituted into new form (Gal. iii. 26-28; 1 Cor. iii. 21-23). Christianity in this view is a new creation, greater and more glorious than the first (Col. i. 16-18). All moral relations come, *in Christ*, to new significance and force. He is such a real fountain of freedom and power, as never was in the world before. What the law could not do, being weak through the flesh, (Rom. viii. 3, 4,) is accomplished by the mystery of the incarnation; the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, sets men free from the law of sin and death. He is himself, our righteousness and life, (1 Cor. i. 30,) *in whom* we have redemption through his blood, (Eph. i. 7,) and *by whom* we have received the atonement (Rom. v. 11). He has abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light (2 Tim. i. 10). He is the foundation of the Church; it starts in his person; its whole magnificent structure serves only to reveal the full force of the mystery of godliness here brought into view, (1 Tim. iii. 15, 16,) the riches of the glory of God's inheritance in the saints, and the exceeding greatness of his power towards them that believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him on his own right hand in the heavenly places (Eph. i. 18-20).

Again, however, we forbear. The difficulty is not to find proofs in the New Testament for the position here called in question, but to make room for them and set them in order. They crowd into view from every side. The idea of a new creation flowing from Christ, and actually lodging in the constitution of the world the force and power of a divine life which was not in it before, may be said to underlie, as a tacit assumption at least, every portion of the evangelical record. To *our* ears it sounds strangely, we confess, to hear this view of Christianity called in question by any who pretend to follow the Bible as their rule and guide. If the incarnation wrought no change in the spirit-

ual posture of the world, but left it in its relations, capacities and powers, just what it was from the beginning, we may well ask with trembling anxiety: In what then did it consist, and what force has it for our salvation? *Could* the mystery be real, if it brought no real difference into our life? Can we rationally admit at all the entrance of the Eternal Word into the organism of humanity, if the fact be so taken as to involve no modification still of its previous state, no entrance into it at the same time of a new principle of light and life? The question is not, of course, whether the human world out of Christ remains what it was before; but whether that part of it which is comprehended in Christ, and which forms thus the true central stream of its history, has not come to be filled with new substance and sense. The new creation holds in the bosom of the Church and not beyond it; but it holds there, at the same time, as the inmost substantial sense of humanity itself, the form in which it is required to become universally complete. Christianity, so far as it prevails, is the actual elevation of our general life into a higher sphere of existence. History is made to possess contents by it, which had no place in it before. The possibility of a real and full solution of the problem of man's life, hangs on the actual coming of Christ in the flesh (1 John v. 4, 5, 11, 12, 20). By this, humanity is made complete. He brings into it light, life and immortality, is himself the principle, and fountain, and immediate ground of all this, in the constitution it receives through his person. Just here is the broad chasm, which separates between all rationalism and the true christian faith. The Unitarian sees in Christ only an outward teacher, who accomplishes our salvation by his excellent doctrine and holy example. Does it, however, alter the case materially, to allow the mystery of the incarnation, and yet turn it into an outward *occasion* only in the service of the same end? If Christ be no *principle* of life for humanity, if he be not in truth the power of a new creation in its constitution, it follows necessarily that it needs nothing of this sort for its redemption. This is at once Pelagianism.

Let us not be told then, that it savors of the transcendental, and contradicts the Bible, to say that "the Lord is perpetually born anew in the hearts of believers," and that Christ is the "principle of a new creation" for the human race. It savors sadly of the *rationalistic*, to have any other view; and we may well be amazed, to find such skepticism placidly arrogating to itself the title *evangelical*, as its own special distinction, and boldly underpinning its want of faith with the pretended wholesale authority of the Bible. Unitarianism plants itself too on the "teaching of the Bible," with quite as much reason, and full as good a grace.

J. W. N.

UNIVERSAL HISTORY—THE INDIANS.

Preliminary Remarks.

We now leave China and pass over to the history of India. But it is necessary to premise that our attention will be exclusively occupied with its western division, or as it is now called, Hindostan. Chin-India, or Farther India, and the Indian islands, have never been the theatre of any eminent historical exploits. As their inhabitants never contributed to the growth of society, or the advance of civilization, we pass them by without any further notice. Those nations alone have a valid claim on our consideration which had a character peculiar to themselves, or exerted a controlling influence on the world in a political, scientific, artistic and religious way.

Geographical Outline.

The mighty peninsula of India, like Italy, in Europe, stretches its immense surface southward towards the Indian Ocean. Its southern portion, known in history by the name of Decan, and forming the peninsula proper, is surrounded by water, and occupies a naturally isolated position. Its northern portion, which is traversed by two large rivers, the Indus and the Ganges, extends to the base of the Solyman and Himmaleh mountains. Its natural qualities and geographical features are distinguished by their grandeur and by their variety. Its scenery is sublime and enchanting. Surrounded by the Arabian sea and the Indian ocean, irrigated by two noble streams which pour their fertilizing inundations over a vast extent of territory, embracing within its bounds the declivities of three mountain ranges, and well-watered plains of unvaried riches and unbounded luxuriance, wild, ferocious animals, it possesses an unexampled power of vegetation, tall, majestic forests, stately palms, aromatic shrubs, and every variety of natural productions in rich abundance. In this country so admirably adapted for the cultivation of a civilization peculiarly its own, have flourished from the earliest periods on record, a remarkable race, whose history is well worthy of our notice. Hindostan extends somewhat above twenty-four hundred miles from north to south, in breadth about fifteen hundred miles from east to west.

Influence of these Geographical Relations.

In India as well as in China, the physical configuration of the country has left its impress clearly printed upon the character of its inhabitants. The surface of China presents a uniform aspect; its social, political, intellectual and religious spirit is marked by a tedious sameness, never strives to surmount the culture it has already attained. Not so with India. An endless diversity is the main feature of its geography. Nature seems to have been determined to favor Hindostan with all the innumerable forms of her beautiful life. Here the most opposite extremes that can possibly exist on the surface of our planet, meet and extend to each other the hand of friendship. Her face wears a continually changing aspect. India is split into several distinct divisions, differing in formation and appearance. In the north and in Decan, the rivers run in totally different directions; chains of lofty mountains, large, extended tablelands, deep fruitful valleys, uninhabited deserts and unhealthy marshes, are scattered over the country. Its surface never presents an even, harmonious appearance, but is broken into numerous sections, each marked by particular features. The Indians likewise have not the same character throughout, but seem to correspond to the special locality they severally inhabit. An intense individuality approaching to egotism, which spurns intercourse with foreigners, marks their character.

History of the Indians.

The history of Hindostan divides itself naturally into three principal periods. As for many centuries past it has made no real advancement in civilization, we will pursue the same course we took with China, and delineate its history from its beginning down to the present day, confining ourselves to the most important facts.

The First Period.

1600 B. C.—327 B. C.

Of the character and civilization of the people who are said to have inhabited India previous to the year 1600, as well as of the chronological tables used by Indian historians, we possess no satis-

factory accounts. It is a fact, however, authenticated by indubitable evidence, that about this time a powerful race descended from the Northern mountains and subjugated the country. Of the fabulous accounts which obscure the records of these early times, we will only mention the supposed invasion of Semiramis, the celebrated queen of Assyria and Bactria, during the reign of the Indian monarch Stabrobates (in Sancrit, *Stha vara patis*, lord of the world). It was recorded by Ctesias, a Grecian author, who imagined that it occurred in the year 2000 B. C. The account of the victorious march of Sesostris, who is said to have overrun entire India, rests throughout on no historical probability whatever. The annals both of India and Egypt, contain no notice of these expeditions; nor have modern researches thrown any light upon the subject.

Beside other weighty considerations, which seem to prove that India came into contact with the western world at any early period, the Scriptural account of the commerce carried on by the Phœnicians and Jews, in the time of Solomon, with Ophir, and a few expressions to be found in the writings of Homer, point most clearly to an acquaintance with the Sancrit language and India.* It may be affirmed with considerable certainty, that the Indians, though they never travelled beyond the bounds of their native land, carried on, nevertheless, a considerable commerce with the Phœnicians, 1000 B. C., whose enterprising spirit led them forth from their homes to explore distant countries.

On account of the scarcity of authentic sources of information, our knowledge of the first period of Indian history, which extends to the year 327 B. C., when Alexander the Great invaded the country, is exceedingly limited. Every truly important historical occurrence proceeded from the activity of the Arier or Sancrit people, who had abandoned their abodes in the northern mountains and conquered India. During this period, the division of the inhabitants into four orders, or castes, took its rise. The manner of its origin is

* REMARK.—The word *κυστήρεψος*, for example, in Homer, is closely allied to the Sancrit *Kastiza*. Besides, the length of the voyage to and from Phœnicia, as described in the Bible, favors the supposition that Ophir was situated in India. On the western coast of India was situated a city similar in sound to the name Ophir. In addition to all this, it must be borne in mind, that in the Coptic dialect, India is always called Sophir.

involved in darkness. About the year 540 B. C., died Gauthana Buddha, the founder of Buddhism.

In the present state of historical knowledge, it is impossible to determine the peculiar character of this religious system. It sprung up in opposition to the hierachial tendencies and doctrines of Brahminism ; its object was, to reform the existing religious condition of the country. It reached the height of its prosperity and glory about the year 240 B. C. The Persian kings, Cyrus and Darius, undertook the conquest of India, but without any decided success. Their dominion extended over a very small portion of the country. No important results were occasioned by their efforts to subjugate it. Their invasions may be regarded as so many preparations for the victorious career of Alexander the Great.

Second Period.

327 B. C.—1000 A. D.

The invasion of India by Alexander the Great, constitutes a remarkable epoch in its history. His own ambitious spirit, which aimed at the conquest of the then known world, urged him to attempt the subjugation of a country that had baffled the energies of his predecessors. At the solicitation of the Indian king, Taxiles, or Tacshailas, who was at enmity with his neighbors, he commenced his march. As Western India was torn by violent dissensions and its power weakened, Alexander found no difficulty in penetrating beyond the Indus to the river Hyphasis, now called Sutledge. On the banks of the Hydaspes, he was vigorously assailed by Porus, or Phoor, who had collected an army of the bravest men India could furnish. His soldiers terrified by the extensive desert which it was necessary to pass in order to reach the Ganges, mutinied. Alexander was compelled to return. He sent his fleet down the Indus, and returned himself to the West by a long and laborious march through immense deserts.

After his death, his successors unfortunately dismembered his extensive empire. The Indian possessions—the precise number of which we cannot tell—which his bravery had acquired, were neglected. Internal distractions gradually consumed the political strength of the nation. A state of disorder ensued. Ambitious individuals, whose only interest was self-aggrandizement, watched the opportunity for seizing the reins of government. One of them, by name

Chandragupta, more bold than the rest—whose history, however, is so intermingled by fabulous accounts, and so variously represented by Brahminical and Buddhist writers, who mutually contradict each other, that nothing certain about his life is known beyond the date of his reign, 300 B. C.—usurped the throne. He is said to have commenced his march at Penjab, to have traversed the whole of India, and provoked Seleucus, king of Syria, to undertake an expedition against himself, which resulted in no important consequences. Recently discovered coins prove beyond doubt, that several smaller kingdoms, founded originally by Grecian immigrants, continued to flourish in the middle of the second century before the Christian era. But now the power of the Indian nation was effectually broken. Its shattered condition occasioned irruptions, (2 B. C.) which it could not withstand, by nomadic tribes from the north and north-east, and by the Sakas, a Scythian nation, who succeeded in establishing a new and extensive kingdom in North India. But though externally harrassed by barbarous enemies, India, under the moulding influences of Grecian thought, revived its true spirit by a vigorous and successful cultivation of science. During this period, Sancrit literature attained to an unusual height of prosperity and glory. Great praise must be awarded to Greece, so insignificant in political magnitude, but infinitely superior to all other nations in the achievements of Science and Art. Her influence at this time did not only arouse to fresh activity the dormant energies of the Orient, but was engaged in obtaining a complete mental victory over the Romans who had destroyed her political independence.

The kingdom of the Sakas was of short duration. Internal feuds hurried it to ruin. It was subverted by Vicramaditya, 56 B. C. His reign had been made immortal by the most brilliant achievements of India art and science. Indian literature burst forth in its richest bloom. The circumstances of the age were extremely favorable to the growth of thought. Brahminism, which had for some years past lost its influence, was resuscitated, and again became the predominant religion of the country. But the intellectual bloom of this period soon withered. Fresh hordes who extended their dominion to Benares on the Ganges, broke in from the north, and interrupted the progress of the country. A time of gradual internal dissolution follows; a host of petty dynasties spring up in the lesser kingdoms. Here the thread of our narrative is broken. Various contradictory

statements concerning the condition of this period, render a true account of it almost impossible. Pliny, the celebrated Roman historian, gives an account of an important commercial intercourse between Rome and India, 50 A. D. In the year 80 A. D., Salivahanu succeeded to the throne. During his reign, India carried on some trade with China. The character of this king is so beclouded with fabulous myths, that it is absolutely impossible to perceive the truth they may contain. A long period now ensues of which we have no satisfactory account. But it is certain that in the north an extensive Cashmere empire was established, while the rest of India was divided into a multitude of petty kingdoms. Bardesanus, of Babylon, who set out on a travelling expedition from Rome, in the year 220 A. D., gives us some valuable information respecting them. After the supremacy of the Scythians in India had been abolished, the new Persian empire of the Sassanidæ took forcible possession of a portion of Indian territory. From this time onward, through a long series of years, we are not able to trace with exact precision the course of Indian history. With the rise of Mohammedanism, which in the seventh century spread from Arabia over the Eastern world, a new epoch begins. At this juncture, when a crisis in the condition of India had arrived, no person could be found strong enough to hold the reins of government with a firm and steady hand. The distractions which now agitated the nation from one extremity to the other, prepared the way for the victory of Mohammedanism.

Third Period.

711 A. D.—the present day.

During this period, India fell into the hands of foreign powers. The Mohamedans, in particular, committed extensive depredations, plundered province after province, and planted the Crescent so firmly, that succeeding ages acknowledged its claims. Amid these vicissitudes of fortune, the peculiarities of Indian character remained unchanged.

It would lead us too far beyond our prescribed limits, to describe in detail the conflicts which terminated at last in the complete supremacy of Mohammedanism. It stretched its dominion from Golconda to the East Indian sea, and curtailed the power of the kings to such an extent, that very few sovereigns in the sixteenth century

exercised an independent sway. The Portuguese, on the other hand, began to extend their domains by the settlement of colonies along the coasts of India, but were not able to retain the possessions they had usurped. Their expulsion was hastened by the pernicious operation of the iniquitous government they had introduced. What a deficiency of moral power could not effect, they tried to accomplish by the tortures of the Inquisition. In the year 1600, the English, and in 1602, the Hollandish East India companies were instituted. The English taking advantage of the weakness of India, occasioned by internal feuds, which were conducted by the warlike Mahrattas against the great Mogul, gradually established a complete system of government, regulated by prudent laws and supported by an efficient military power. In opposition to the French, who for some time endeavored to check their victorious march, but without success, and the sagacious Hyder Ali, king of Mysore, who proved to be a more powerful opponent, the English steadily advanced to the consummation of their designs. A treaty having been ratified in the year 1792, with Tippoo Sultan, the son of Hyder Ali, which secured to them many advantages, and he himself having been slain in battle, (1799,) the English obtained unlimited sway and partitioned his kingdom. Every philanthropist will return a hearty response to the wish that the supremacy of a Christian nation may in the end renovate the national character of India, and communicate a spirit which will promote the interests of its immense population.

The Character and Social Condition of the Indians.

Whilst it is almost impossible, on account of the uncommon magnitude both of their history and their country, to reduce to general principles their moral character and social habits, we will be assisted in forming some conception of them by keeping in mind this single fact, that, notwithstanding all external influences which tended to repress their national spirit, the old Sancrit life, though revealed in a thousand individual forms, survived every change, and constitutes to this day the predominant feature of Hindoo character.

According to old occidental accounts, the inhabitants of India were a prudent, virtuous, courageous people, with minds capable of

discerning and appreciating foreign modes of thought. One peculiar feature in their character is, a lawless and uncommonly extravagant imagination combined, in an unusual way, with a clear, penetrating understanding. In manly energy they are deficient. Their patience in enduring calamities exceeds their activity in combatting them. Though not distinguished for genuine manliness, they are very affectionate, fond of meditation, and inclined to the mystical and profound in science. In form, color, and contour of face, they present extreme diversity. Their faces are generally of an oval shape; eyes and hair black; look, placid and gentle. The females of the higher classes are often possessed of bewitching beauty; their limbs smoothly rounded, features mild, and skin fair and tender. In their dress the Indians are passionately fond of gaudy ornaments; they often color their beards, their nails, and even their hair. Of games and plays they are devoted lovers. They are said to have invented the game of chess about 200 B. C.

In the different provinces, the common customs of social life vary. In this respect India occupies a higher position than China, where a universal sameness reigns. The Brahmins expend great care in the education of their children, particularly of the male portion. Indeed, the Indians generally have excellent talents for the study of foreign languages, and for the pursuits of science.

The proper idea of marriage and the true dignity of woman, have never been realized in India. Polygamy is very generally practised, and not unfrequently polyandry. For the female sex the marriageable age is the eighth, for the males, the fifteenth. Though the female is not debarred from a participation in the active duties of life, she is nevertheless regarded as the slave of the husband. In earlier times, it seems, woman was clothed with more dignity and commanded more respect. The dead are either burnt or buried, or drowned, or exposed. The Holy Books of India justify suicide on the part of the aged who may be weary of life. Slaves, who never existed in the earliest history of India, are either free or bound; they generally receive kind treatment.

Their Government.

The Holy Books of India recognize as the only proper form of government an hereditary monarch, regulated by the laws of primo-

geniture. But its history furnishes a number of deviations from this established rule. During the reign of Alexander, there flourished several free states, whose very independence attracted the rage and reproach of their neighbors. Kings did not enjoy the exercise of unlimited power, but were restrained by the system of castes, by religious relations, and by family connections.

It is difficult to determine with precise accuracy whether, as some Indian writers affirm, only one king reigned in India. The education of the royal family was entrusted to the Brahmins, who were exempted on this account from pecuniary exactions. But the entire nation was subjected to a system of taxation, under the control of the king, who was regarded as the administrator of justice and the representative of the Divine will.

In their judicial proceedings, the Indians frequently resorted to appeals to the decisions of heaven. They seldom made use of the oath. In the earliest times, the visitations of fortune were regarded as clear manifestations of retributive justice.

The army was originally composed of a particular caste, set apart for the defence of the country, called Cshatriyas. When Buddhism obtained the supremacy, the soldiers were selected from all the castes. The present Anglo-indian army numbers about two hundred thousand men, most of whom are natives, the remainder Europeans.

The division of the people into *castes*, is the most striking feature in the political organization of India; an institution that has effectually retarded the progress of civilization, by sanctioning the existence of different orders of society which never come into contact with each other, and the transmission of dignities from father to son in fixed hereditary succession. The Buddhists, who never could furnish or substantiate any claims to pure descent from a regular caste family, endeavored to crush this great hierarchical fabric, but without permanent success. To this day, its power, though somewhat limited by the influence of the English, continues to be immense. According to the representations of the Brahmins, who boast of their pure extraction, the only genuine castes now extant, are their own, the Sudras, the remains of the Cshatryas, and some mixed families.

According to the primitive division, the Brahmins compose the first, or sacerdotal caste. Their proper employment consists in stu-

dying and expounding the Sacred Books, some of which are said to have been originally a portion of the essence of Brahma himself, in offering and instituting sacrifices, in distributing and receiving alms. Though regarded as the representatives of the Divine being and as his priests on earth, they are permitted to engage in no war, in trade, in commerce, and other practical pursuits, such as collecting taxes, defending the frontiers whenever threatened with attack, teaching, writing and the study of the heavens. The Cshatriyas,* or military class, from which the kings are generally chosen, are second in dignity. Their chief occupation is war. Only in cases of extreme necessity, are they allowed to cultivate the arts of peace. The Vaiyas rank third. They are composed of farmers and merchants. Agriculture was held in such high esteem, that in time of war the members of this caste are allowed to till their lands in perfect security. Lowest in the scale of castes stand the Sudras, who occupy a very degraded position. They were compelled to perform the most menial offices for the Brahmins, who in turn were bound to provide for their temporal support. Every attempt on their part to accumulate property was prohibited by their tyrannical masters.

They dare not venture even to open a page of the Sacred Books without incurring the danger of the severest anathemas. In the course of time, however, the condition of this caste was materially improved. At the present day, the Sudras compose the majority of the population, carry on trade and commerce, receive homage from several guilds, and exercise a kind of jurisdiction. The Pariahs, who are regarded as devoid of caste and consequently entitled to no respect, compose the lowest class of Hindoo society. These unfortunate beings, though forming the forty-first portion of the entire population, live in a state of utter degradation. According to the social system of India, they are looked upon as being constitutionally unclean; their touch is pollution. The haughty Brahmins particularly, in whose presence they dare not stand a single moment without the forfeit of their lives as the penalty, treat them with the most scornful contempt. And yet classes may be found in India which are compelled to submit to still more dishonorable treatment than even the Pariahs receive. It is very evident to the

* From the Sancrit root Kschi; in the Greek language, e. g., ἀράχτος, (ἀράξ,) κτάομαι, ruler, possessor.

most superficial observer, that such a code of morality as these practices prove to have been in operation, must have exerted a very pernicious influence on the moral character of society in general, and prevented the expansion of mind.

We have now given a very brief description of government as it exists in India. What decision shall be passed upon it? Has it in the main advanced or retarded the march of civilization? Its system of caste split society into innumerable divisions and subdivisions which kept the various interests of life in an immutable subordination. Had not its different departments thus sundered been compacted by a superstitious religion, complete disorganization would have been the inevitable result. But what are the necessary conditions for a healthful state of society? As was remarked in the history of the Chinese, the general social life which underlies every individual activity, must never remain stationary, but advance from inferior to higher stages of culture. On the other hand, freedom and liberal encouragement must be granted unto the members of every government for the cultivation of personal character and for the expansion of personal thought. If any one of these forces gains the ascendancy, the equilibrium of society is destroyed, and its progress checked. In India, the improvement of the individual beyond a certain point was impossible. The caste system confined him to a particular sphere, in which he was compelled forever to move. As the prospect for elevation into a higher class was shut out, his efforts at self-improvement were weak and trifling. But whilst this system so prejudicial in its operation, repressed the aspirations of individual minds, it stamped upon the whole nation the character of *individuality*. Under its action, the life of the nation was subdivided into a thousand individual forms, distinguished by striking features of difference. Thus, in the end, the individual principle of society gained the preponderance, and its general interests suffered neglect. In this respect, Indian civilization differs very materially from that of China. The one is characterized by the tyranny of despotism over personal liberty, the other, by the predominance of individual activity over that of society at large. In China, every department presents a dry, monotonous appearance; its culture is stationary; all is at a stand-still. In India, the surface of society is diversified by innumerable phases of private individual activity; but its culture is likewise stationary. Thus these two extreme systems of social

life, proceeding from different positions, find a point of unity in this, that both preclude the possibility of a solid and progressive civilization. Under their influence, a permanent advance towards true spiritual freedom is impossible.

As the Mohammedan, Persian, and Christian portions of Indian population took no prominent part in Indian history, so far as government is concerned, we will postpone their consideration to a more convenient season.

Indian Art.

Upon the artistic productions of the Indians, are impressed the prominent features of their character, tenderness of feeling and liveliness of imagination. An overflowing fullness of fancy must reveal its contents in outward forms; it cannot remain locked up within the narrow confines of individual minds, but struggles to come to clear, full expression. The Indians, who passed almost their entire existence in the land of fancy, stimulated by what may be called an irrepressible poetic instinct, involuntarily clothed their profound thoughts either in the garb of imagery, or stamped them upon the materials of nature. Here again the culture of India surpasses that of China. The Chinese move forever in the treadmill of the finite Understanding; they see only with the eye of sense; the supersensible is beyond their apprehension. The true artist cannot bear to be tantalized with the question, *Cui bono?*; but the Chinese can see no sense in anything but profit and loss calculations. Art is the *organic* representation of ideas; but the Chinese have "wooden heads filled with clock-work."

The remains of art are scattered over India in rich profusion; but the period of their execution cannot be accurately determined. The temples employed for religious service, seem to have been of the most costly and magnificent description. Those found at Salsetse and Elephanta, are the most remarkable. They all bear the same general character, having been excavated in the sides of mountains, with pillars, images, and openings at the top. The cave-temples of the Brahmins have flat roofs and columns, often tastefully decorated; the walls are ornamented with paintings. The Holy place, in which stand the images of their gods, are sometimes left open above. The Buddhist temple has a different character. Its

largest area embraces a semicircle; an arch spans the holiest place; underneath it stands the symbolical Dagob, in the form of a water bubble; tanks, galleries, siderooms, and the other usual departments fill up the interior.

The Pagodas, which seem to be of modern origin, dating in all probability from the Middle Ages, represent an essentially distinct order of architecture. They are stone buildings, fashioned after the form of a pyramid, having voluted figures and crowded with ornaments. The impression they convey to the eye of the beholder is rather indistinct and confused.

In the decoration of their religious temples, the plastic arts did efficient service. The antiquarian, in his investigations into the remains of Indian art, will often discover reliefs and free figures which bear evident marks of an early origin. But in this respect our limited knowledge will not justify us in passing any decisive sentence on the value of Indian labor. Their statues evince some nobleness of feeling; presenting a harmonious appearance with symmetrical proportions, with features correctly taken, and emotions delicately shaded. But some of their productions, though symbolical in their design, have a fantastic character, at variance with æsthetical beauty. None of them, however, are childish, or without meaning. As the Indian seldom descends from the region of poetic dreams to the solid land of reality, his plastic representations partake of a mystical rather than a true historical character. His constitutionally unhistoric disposition has stamped a fabulous impress upon the products of his imagination.

Of the period when Indian painting reached the height of its prosperity, we have not sufficient knowledge to enable us to form a just judgment. Isolated specimens have been discovered which have elicited much praise. Their more recent performances in this department, possess large attractions, and are executed with a peculiar grace and finish.

As the Indian language contains many mythological elements, it is reasonable to suppose, (what facts fully prove,) that they possess considerable talent for music. The seven tones of the scale have been long familiar with them. They make use of the lyre, the drum, and other instruments not necessary to mention. Of dancing they are immoderately fond; in pantomimic feats, they give expression to their excited feelings.

The religion and poetry of India are so intimately connected, that they mutually explain and illustrate each other. The most ancient and holiest books, called the Vedas, contain their earliest poetical productions. But Indian poetry attained its perfection in the great epic narratives of the Mahabara and its episodes. Its elevated theosophic speculations sometimes approach the region of poetical intuition. When Buddhism gained the ascendant, a collection of old works was made, which resulted in the discovery of rich materials, comprising such productions as the heroic poem Rāmayona and the Harivansa. Epic poetry flourished down to the twelfth century of the Christian era. At a very early period religious lyric poetry received a very considerable share of attention. In connection with music and dancing, it occasioned the rise of dramas. The best specimen of dramatic poetry is the Sacondala, or the Fatal Ring. Nor was the cultivation of didactic poetry overlooked. The best productions in this department, are ascribed to Calidas, who is also supposed to have been the author of two very beautiful elegies still extant. He lived in the year 56 B. C. In amatory poetry the glowing imagination of the Indians produced much that breathes the genuine feeling of nature. Its moral tendency, however, may be questioned. In the writing of satires and the invention of fables, they evinced considerable talent.

The literature of India never acquired a permanent influence over the minds of the people, owing, no doubt, to the operation of the caste system. The highest caste alone, that of the Brahmins, were devoted to the cultivation of the sciences; the inferior orders were never allowed to participate in the achievements of intellect.

Indian Science.

As we intend to describe the philosophy of India in connection with its religion, we will make a few brief remarks upon its scientific character generally. Recent investigations, conducted by men of extensive erudition, whose love of learning stimulated them to unlock the treasures of Indian literature, which had been kept so long concealed by the Brahmins, concur in proving that the Hindoos have made an astonishing advance in the cultivation of science. In mathematics, particularly, they are noted for skill and ingenuity.

One of their treatises on geometry contains the celebrated proposition, that the square on the hypothenuse of a right angled triangle, is equal to the square of the two other sides. The problem, to find the area of a triangle, its three sides being known, of which the old Greek geometers were ignorant, was solved by them. The numeral ciphers in use with the Arabians, and introduced by them into Europe, were borrowed from the Indians. In algebra, they were able to solve equations of more than one unknown quantity. Their attention was also occupied with the study of arithmetic and trigonometry. As regards other departments of natural science, they paid particular attention to medicine.

In the study of geography, the Hindoos never allow themselves to enter into minute descriptions of countries and seas, of climate and natural productions, and of other items necessary to a complete knowledge of our planet; but indulge in fanciful speculations on the construction of the earth. In history, they cannot be trusted as faithful guides. Their historical annals convey no distinct knowledge of the manners of an age, nor do they contain a trustworthy account of facts; but are filled with fabulous representations of deities and heroes, who perhaps never had an existence. Equally extravagant is their system of chronology. The arbitrary practice of connecting immense periods, exceeding at times two millions of years, in which they delighted to indulge, seems to prove that, in the investigation of historical facts, they were not guided by any definite principles of analysis, but by the vagaries of an exuberant imagination, which overleaped the bounds of probability.

Indian Religion.

The most valuable sources of information concerning this particularly interesting portion of history, are old Indian works, reaching back far beyond the period of the Egyptian hierarchy and the most ancient civilization of Greece. On account of their immense antiquity, which necessarily precludes the possibility of obtaining an accurate knowledge of the age when they were composed, our judgment concerning their merits must be rather unsatisfactory. It is settled by the unanimous consent of all acquainted with the subject, that the *Vedas* (from the Sancrit *vidga*, law) or the *Holy Books*,

comprise the oldest productions of Hindoo literature.* Next in age and dignity, come the Puranas, composed, according to most recent researches, 1600 B. C., which contain mythological theogonies and cosmogonies. The third rank is assigned to the two great epic poems, the Mahabarat and Ramayana, supposed to have been written 1200 B. C. Lastly, the collection of the Laws of Menu, completes the sources of information on this subject. Besides these, we may mention as worthy of some notice, the fragmentary poetical and philosophical writings of India.

Upon the earliest manifestations of the religious life of India, are clearly impressed the artless and unprejudiced feelings of childhood, the boundless and unbridled imagination of youth. In accounting for its origin, Hindoo mythology points to the mighty hill Meru, "a most exalted mass of glory, reflecting the sunny rays from the splendid surface of its gilded horns. It is adorned with trees and pleasant streams, and resounds with the delightful songs of various birds." Suddenly on its summit appears the mysterious Brahm, who had hitherto been concealed in a divine slumber, but now comes forth to reveal his heavenly essence. From his bosom emanate, by the power of his creative energies, Brahma, the creator, Vishnu, the preserver of life, Siva, the destroyer of life. In these three divine appearances, is revealed the nature of the Supreme Mind. With the time when this remarkable revelation occurred, the religious life of India begins to unfold itself. Temples sprung up in every portion of the country, and the smoke of innumerable sacrifices ascended in honor of Siva. By the power of Brahm, men, women, genii, and all other individual existences which are scattered over the earth, were brought into being. Having fulfilled their mission, they return again to the great soul of the universe, are swallowed up in Brahm, the original unity, like snow-flakes in rivers, like rivers in oceans.

What is the significance of this poetic representation? A profound thought undoubtedly lies here hid; the recognition of one supreme Ruler of the universe, denominated Para-brahm, who reveals himself in a three-fold character, as Creator, (Brahma,) as Preserver, (Vishnu,) as Destroyer, (Siva). These distinct divine exist-

* The student is referred to the *Asiatic Researches*, vol 81. p. 377, by Colebrooke, who has investigated the subject with commendable diligence.

ences, represented symbolically by the three natural elements, earth, fire and water, compose the Hindoo Trimourti, or Trinity.* This incomprehensible mystery, which cannot be imaged forth so as to be fully understood, but may be veiled under symbols, is expressed by the enigmatical symbol O'M. Brahma is the one absolute, eternal being, the only real existence; the world with its innumerable forms of life is a dream, a phantom, an illusion, destined to hurry back into the bosom whence it sprang. In him things visible and things invisible become identical. Without form himself, he is the source of all forms; smaller than the atom which floats in the air, he is larger than the universe. Without hand or foot he runs rapidly, and grasps firmly; without eyes he sees, without ears he hears all; he knows whatever can be known; but there is none who knows him."

Various hypotheses have been advanced to explain the manner in which the Hindoo Trinity took its rise. If we run through the records of history, we will discover that the religious systems of most nations contain some representation, in a distorted form, of a three-fold principle which manifests its presence in the world. It would seem as if the Divine author of our being had engraven upon the tablet of the soul this mysterious truth.

Such was the first and simplest character of the religion of India. It is evident that the whole system rests upon a Pantheistic conception of the world, which pervades all the theological speculations of the Hindoos. It obliterates the distinction between the Creator and the creature, between the Infinite and finite, animates the world itself with a portion of the divine essence, and terminates its career by virtually divesting God of an independent personality, by degrading his nature to the idea of a universal soul, which underlies like an immense substratum all forms of life. In the course of time, attempts were made to represent the divine essence by a description of particular attributes. But they resulted in the corruption of the

* The difference between the Indian Trinity and that of the Christian Church, is broad and marked:

1. Metaphysical; in the Christian Trinity there is no absorption either of any of its persons or of any individuals its creative power has called into existence.

2. Moral; according to Christian conceptions, the Trinity reveals its presence for the purpose of effecting the moral renovation and perfection of man.

ancient faith, by ascribing an independent character to the attributes themselves, and by the introduction of a host of innumerable gods ; in the dissolution of the religious ideas originally embodied in the mythical representations of Brahm, and in the ascendancy finally, of Feticism.

Hindoo cosmogonies teach that, after Brahm awoke from the slumbers in which he had been originally sunk, he entered into a state of self-contemplation, and created the world. In the moment of creation, there emanated from his bosom men and the other occupants of the earth, who thus became participants of his essence. According to the accounts recorded in the sacred books, the different castes sprung from some particular member of his body ; the Brahmins from his mouth, the Cshatryas from his arm, the Vaisyas from his thigh, the Sudras from his foot.

Closely connected with the doctrine of Creation, stands the Indian of Avatars, or the divine Incarnations. Before the destruction of the world, mankind must pass through four immense periods of time, comprising 4,320,000 years. When these years shall have completed their course, the world will be absorbed by Brahm, its great Author. Meanwhile Vishnu descends to the earth, and assumes various visible forms whenever danger threatens the human family. In the performance of his work, he has already experienced successive transformations in the form of a fish, of a boar, of a half-man and half-lion, in the characters of Parasu Rama, Rama, and Bala Rama. The Hindoos anxiously await the last avatar of Vishnu, when he will appear on a white horse, armed with a sword, to destroy the sin that contaminates the world. Many legends are extant concerning his avatar into Krishna, which bring to mind the fabulous accounts of Osiris of Egypt, and Hercules of Greece.

So far as the moral life of the Indians is concerned, their theory of regeneration exerted the greatest influence. Pride is regarded as the cause of sin. Even the Divine being himself became tainted with its impurity, and must submit to a process of purification. The fundamental conception of the theory is, *that matter as such, is substantially evil.* Salvation, therefore, from the power of sin, can only be obtained by striving to effect the annihilation of the natural life, by imposing upon the physical man such burdens as will eventually crush the activity of the body. A person who wishes to be delivered from the bonds of nature, must recognize, by a process,

of abstract, oft repeated meditation, in the powers of nature and the members of his own body, nothing but illusions. Complete absorption in Brahm, forms the completion of his salvation. Penances and self-torture of the most excruciating character have been practised by the Hindoos from time immemorial, in the firm conviction that they are absolutely essential to the attainment of holiness.

Another prominent feature in Hindoo religion is, the doctrine of transmigration, as taught in all the philosophic schools of India. According to this belief, the souls of men after death do not depart to their final resting place, but they assume some other body, generally that of an animal. After having gone through successive metamorphoses, from the stone to the plant, from the plant to the animal, and having discharged the penalty of their sins, they attain to their most perfect state, that is, complete absorption in the great soul, Atma, so as to destroy altogether the idea of personality and individual self-consciousness.

The radical error of Brahminism, consists in a defective conception of the two constituent parts of human life, and of the relation they sustain to each other. Of the Unity of body and soul, it had not the smallest notion, but regarded them as occupying a position of mutual repugnance. According to their view, the body seems to have been an unnecessary and burdensome appendage—the prison house in which the soul was confined and restrained from the enjoyment of its spiritual faculties—the net which encircled the man and prevented him from ascending into the bosom of Brahm. In opposition to this false conception, true religion proposes for its object the gradual purification of the body—not its annihilation—by means of spiritual influences. The whole person as composed of body and soul, must be subjected to a process of sanctification which will result in the salvation of both.

Against the despotic tendencies of Brahminism which as the exclusively religious caste, was disposed to stretch its authority beyond proper bounds, there arose the system of Buddhism. In the accomplishment of their object, viz: the destruction of the barriers that confined religion to a single caste, the disciples of Gautava introduced preaching into the public service, rejected the use of the obsolete Sancrit, substituted the language of the people, recognized and respected their rights in religious concerns. Though Buddhism aroused for a season to fresh activity the spiritual energies of the

nation, it lacked the moral elements necessary to accomplish a reformation, and never succeeded in obtaining a permanent supremacy in the country.* The character of these two conflicting systems and their final tendencies will enable us to form a very correct opinion concerning the prominent features of the Hindoo mind. The history of India warrants the assertion that, in the construction of its society, the principle of individuality—a reflection, as it were—of its geographical diversity—which confined for ever to a particular sphere certain classes of men, gained the preponderance. Buddhism was the application of this principle to religious concerns; inasmuch as it defended the right of private judgment, and affirmed that the relation existing between man and his Maker could not be determined by any body of men who owned no sympathy with his spiritual necessities, but sought rather to oppress him with the tyranny of ecclesiastical bondage. A wildly luxuriant imagination was the ruling faculty of Indian mind. Brahminism, as may easily be gathered from a slight consideration of its ceremonies, and its extravagant myths, did not suppress its activity, but stimulated its exercise by imparting to it a religious character. But the critical, analysing faculty, also, the understanding, asserted its presence in the system of Gantana Boodh, whose better judgment was not easily overpowered by the seductive charms of a distempered fancy. Thus, Brahminism and Buddhism may be regarded as complements of each other, and as the best exponents of Hindoo character.

Concluding Remarks.

We have had occasion to point out the broad and decided difference between the respective rationalities of India and China. The undoubted facts of history compel us to the conclusion that, in originality and depth of thought, in vigor and beauty of imagination, the Indians far surpassed the Chinese. But why did not a people so richly endowed by nature, attain to a matured development of their spiritual faculties, and advance to a superior state of culture? After having reached a certain point, their civilization remained

* It is very evident that an interesting parallel might be drawn between Brahminism and Roman Catholicism on the one hand, and Buddhism and Protestantism on the other.

stationary. Some of the causes which induced this stagnation have been mentioned in a preceding paragraph (§29). But the chief reason remains to be told. In the evolution of its resources, a nation must ever have reference to some *ultimate* object which they are to serve. Whilst its government, its science, its art, each in their own sphere, produce their legitimate results, they must enlist their united energies in one common service; otherwise the benefits they severally entailed upon society, standing in no living connection with each other and not directed towards the attainment of some *universal* end, will terminate with the particular government, science and art which gave them birth. Nor, the activities of a nation in all the departments of human life, must combine themselves in an effort to subordinate the inferior powers of its subjects, which, if allowed to progress unchecked, will draw around it an atmosphere of spiritual darkness, to the dominion of the ennobling faculties of the soul. But in India the order of true culture was reversed; the *flesh* domineered over the *spirit*. It is true indeed that its religious system insisted upon a deliverance from the thraldom of the animal propensities; but in the unnatural struggle to destroy that which was created for immortality, they fell more hopelessly and deplorably, under the power of the bodily instincts. In reading their theosophic speculations which abound in grand and noble ideas, and in beholding their self-inflicted tortures, we admire their longing aspirations after deliverance from the bonds of sense, but cannot approve of the method by which they sought to obtain it. From the bosom of Hindoo society, the *man* could not spring who was to redeem humanity by sanctifying it, and lift it to its appointed moral position by elevating it into union with his own divine nature. "The fullness of the time" had not yet come.

J. S. E.

BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW.

WE are not among those who consider O. A. Brownson, Esq., a mere weathercock in religion, whose numerous changes of faith are sufficient of themselves to convict his last position of falsehood and folly. We can see easily enough in all his variations, a principle of steady motion in the same general direction. He started on one extreme, only to be carried over by regular gradation finally to another. Unitarianism and Romanism are the contrary poles of Christianity, freedom and authority, the liberty of the individual subject and the binding force of the universal object, carried out each, by violent disjunction from the other, into nerveless pantomime and sham. Thus seemingly far apart, however, they are in reality always closely related; just as all extremes, by the force of their own falsehood, have an innate tendency to react, pendulum-wise, into the very opposites from which they seem to fly. Hence, the familiar observation, that Romanism in many cases leads to rationalism and infidelity. In bursting the bonds of mere blind authority, a Ronge has no power to stop in true Protestantism, but swings clear over into the dark void of full unbelief. So it is not unnatural, on the other side, that Rationalism should lead the way occasionally to popery and superstition. This transition we see exemplified in the case of Mr. Brownson. He himself, indeed, speaks of his conversion at times, as if it had come upon him by a sort of miracle, without any such preparation in his previous life. But it is easy enough to see that such was not the case. Forced to feel the hollowness of the ground on which he first stood, his mind had been for years before seeking some better settlement, by a succession of experiments, which, though not, of course, to his own consciousness, yet in truth and in fact, looked all along towards the full spiritual somerset, in which they came at length to an end. That they reached this end finally, instead of stopping in some intermediate position, was owing in his case, not to the levity and inconstancy of his mind, but to its earnestness rather and logical severity. We should be very sorry to consider him here the counterpart simply of the infamous Ronge. As a general thing, we may say, it requires far more earnestness to pass from rationalism to popery, than it does to make a like transition from popery to rationalism; and it must ever argue a most vitiated state of religious feeling, where the second case is regarded with more toleration and respect than the first; where the conversion of a Ronge,

for instance, is glorified as the triumph of reason and truth, while the conversion of a Brownson is resolved into sheer dishonesty and caprice. Had the last seen proper to bring his wanderings to an end in Orthodox Congregationalism, in Presbyterianism, in old Lutheranism, or in Protestant Episcopacy, his mutability in either case, *thus far*, would have seemed consistent and rational enough, at least within the bosom of his chosen communion. And yet it was simply because he was more consistent and rational than multitudes in these several positions, that he could *not* thus pause in his movement, but found it necessary to leave them all behind, and to seek shelter for his wearied spirit in the bosom of Rome. We mean not by this, that others may not occupy in good faith such intermediate ground, without having been brought to surmount in their own minds the inward difficulty which made this impossible for Mr. Brownson. They may do so, just because they have never come to be sensible at all of the antagonistic powers out of which the difficulty springs. Let the true nature of this antagonism come to be felt, and their position will be found at the same time to involve a contradiction, out of which, with their reigning principle of religion, they can make no rational escape. So it was in the mind of Mr. Brownson. The very principle which led him to renounce Unitarianism, made it impossible for him to stop short of Romanism. With less light in his understanding, or less firmness in his will, he might have forced it to come to a halt somewhere between. But this would have been for him error only and not truth. The case demanded, for its right solution, a new religious principle and theory altogether. Without this, he felt himself shut up to the alternative already mentioned. He could not be a Congregationalist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, or Episcopalian. He must be either a Rationalist or a Romanist. Had it been possible, he might have liked to be at once both; but as the case could not allow this, he made up his mind finally to bow as he best could to the authority of the Pope. In all this, as we have said, we find no occasion for disparagement or contempt. Our condemnation, rather, is mingled with respect. We reverence earnestness and moral courage, wherever they may come in our way; and we know not that they are more entitled to such homage in the form of perpetual stability and sameness, than they are in the form of necessary revolution and change. Calvin and Melancthon are both great, the one in the uniformity, the other in the fluctuations, of his faith. It is neither by moving, nor by standing still, that men prove the worth of their religion. A faith which has never found occasion to stir an inch from its first moorings, *may be* of far less

value than that which has been carried by wind and wave to a wholly different shore. Nay, even a bad faith, in this view, may be entitled to greater regard, than a faith which is in form more sound; on the well known principle, that a living dog is better than a dead lion.

We are not among those again, who look upon Mr. Brownson's championship of Romanism as either weak or of small account. It is vain to affect, as some do, a supercilious contempt for it, in this view. His mind is naturally of a very acute and strong character; and long, earnest and vigorous exercise has served to clothe it with a measure of dialectical agility and power, such as we rarely meet with on the field at least of our American theology. His reading evidently is extensive and varied; though he is not free from the infirmity, we think, of passing it off frequently, in an indirect way, for something more than its actual worth. He allows himself, for instance, to refer at times, to the German philosophers and theologians, as if he were perfectly at home in their speculations; whereas we have never met with any evidence of his having any more thorough acquaintance with them after all, than that second-hand information which is to be had through the medium of a foreign literature, particularly that of modern France. On the contrary it is sufficiently clear, that he has *not* by any means mastered the best and most profound results of the later German thought; he makes no proper account of the history through which it has passed; affects, indeed, to make light of all history, as applied to the progress of philosophy; and shows himself at fault especially, where the discipline of this thought precisely should come to his help, or, at all events, be intelligently refused, if found wanting, and not merely waved with magisterial hand to the one side. After every necessary drawback, however, in this way, there can be no question of Mr. Brownson's actual knowledge, as going in the walks of philosophy and history, quite beyond the measure of our reigning American education. He is well fitted thus for taking the lead in this country, as a defender of the Roman faith; not because of his having been trained to the science of it in the usual way; for he acknowledges himself that no such study went before his conversion; but in virtue of his general Protestant training, his familiarity with American life, and the dexterity with which, as a practised athlete, he is able to throw his whole strength now into the direction of this new creed. There is a freshness and force in this way in his polemics, which they could not so well possess, perhaps, under any different form. However superior the drilled generalship of a Möhler may be for the theological atmosphere

of Germany, or that of a Wiseman for the ecclesiastical relations of England, it may be doubted whether either of them is as well prepared as Mr. Brownson for carrying the war home to the special habit of thought that prevails with Protestantism on this side of the Atlantic. He is a born Puritan, steeped by education in the element of New England life; the first, probably, who, with anything like the same amount of intellectual culture, has made the transition to Romanism from this most uncatholic coast. He is intimately familiar thus with Puritan modes of thought and forms of life, and is able to take direct account of them continually in the management of his own cause. He deals with Protestantism mainly, as he finds it living and working, at the present time, in these United States, though not without an eye always to its condition and character also in other countries. His Review altogether for one who is prepared to take any real interest in theology and the Church, must be felt to carry with it more than common weight and force; with all its scholastic subtleties and offensive dogmatism, is possessed of much vivacity and point; and is far more readable, it must be confessed, than a large proportion of our current controversy on the opposite side.

It is just one of the miseries of our fashionable pseudo-protestantism, that it legitimates and accepts so readily every sort of polemical assault upon Rome, without proof or examination; as though it were the easiest thing in the world, to fight this battle to purpose; in consequence of which, we are flooded here with more insipid trash, in the name of religious argument, than is to be met with probably in any other quarter. It is with a most wretched grace, that such easy literature, whether figuring in the newspaper, catch-penny book, rostrum, or pulpit, allows itself to overlook and despise the vigorous pen of such a man as Brownson, as though it were a flourish of mere empty words and nothing more. There is nothing gained in the end, but much lost, rather, by such imbecile self-conceit. Over against its blind though proud pretensions, it is no wonder that true learning on the other side should be excited at times to indignant scorn. Mr. Brownson has full right to retort on this spirit, as he often does with withering sarcasm, its own commonplace charges against Romanism. It will not reason; it sets all logic at defiance; it shrinks from the light; it goes blindly and dumbly by its own tradition; it substitutes cant for argument and thought; it turns the Bible into a nose of wax, to suit its own taste; it plays pope as fully as though it were itself the bearer of the triple crown, and held all the thunders of the vatican in its hand. As compared with a very large amount of our popular literature against

Popery in this form, we are constrained to admit, however humiliating the confession may be, that the Review before us bears away the palm completely, as regards both dignity and strength.

It is not unnatural, that Mr. Brownson himself, with such sense as he must have necessarily of his own superiority to the false Protestantism now noticed, (which he of course is very ready to accept also, as the only proper representative of Protestantism in its true form,) should feel his championship of the Roman faith to be of more than ordinary account. He takes pains, it is true, to speak very modestly and humbly of his own deserts; as though he felt himself to be a learner only in this school, and had no right to open his lips in any other capacity. But it is still plain enough, through all this show, that he secretly considers himself notwithstanding, to be something of a giant in the Protestant controversy, and has good hopes of making himself appear so also to others. His tone is bold, confident, overbearing and harsh. He moves throughout with the air of a man, who takes himself to be thoroughly master both of his own cause, and of that of all his opponents besides.¹ He deals his blows like a conscious Hercules, sent forth on divine errand to reform the world. And what is of still more account in the case, his mission in this view seems to receive, not doubtfully, the approbation and sanction of the Church of which he has now become so zealous and dutiful a son. His conversion is counted an important gain, with that of Hurter and Newman, we may well suppose, throughout the Roman world. At all events, it is felt to form a sort of epoch for Romanism in America. Already he has succeeded in gaining fully, as it would appear, the confidence of his ecclesiastical superiors in this country; and neophyte and layman though he be,

¹ Mr. B. is fond of appealing to his own past history and experience, in a way that shows he has not lost the sense of his personal importance towards the world, however much of a child he may feel himself in the arms of the Church. He takes it for granted always, that he has made the whole circle of Protestant knowledge, and has no need to go beyond himself to understand any question here thrown in his way. "Think you that *we*," he exclaims, "who, according to your own story, have tried every form of Protestantism, and disputed every inch of Protestant ground, would ever have left the ranks of Protestantism in which we were born, and under whose banner we had fought so long and suffered so much, if there had been any other alternative for us?"—*July, 1846, p. 386.* Prof Park, Emerson, Neander, Newman, Schaff, Bushnell, &c., in their most profound attempts to get at the intrinsic reason of things, simply go over ground which was familiar long since to his feet, but which a logic still deeper than theirs compelled him afterwards again to abandon.—*Oct. 1845, p. 511, p. 546.*—*Jan. 1847, p. 84.*—*April, 1847, p. 276.*—*Oct. 1849, p. 497.*

is counted worthy to take a foremost place among the expounders and defenders of the Roman faith. At the close of the late Council in Baltimore, through the suggestion of Bishop Kenrick, of Philadelphia, a brief note was addressed to Mr. Brownson, signed by both the archbishops and twenty-three bishops, for the purpose of seconding and encouraging his literary labors in defence of his newly adopted creed, of which he is acknowledged to have proved himself an able and intrepid advocate. This, it must be confessed, is no ordinary recommendation. Coming from such a quarter, and under such a form, it carries with it peculiar significance and force. No wonder that Mr. Brownson should be pleased with it, and thank the prelates "again and again for their act of unexpected and spontaneous kindness." It is, in truth, a solemn *imprimatur* affixed to his Review, by the universal Roman Catholic Church in America; which, of course, in such view, well deserves the attention also of those who stand on the outside of this Church and seek only its destruction. "No higher testimonial could be asked," says the happy editor, "and no higher, out of Rome, could be given; and to say we are grateful, is to say nothing. We thank the eminent prelate who drew up the letter, and each and all of the illustrious Archbishops and Bishops who generously signed it, and gave us their approbation and a pledge of their support. It was more than we deserved, more than we can deserve, more than any editor can deserve; but we will do our best not to make them regret their generous act. We should be oppressed with their approbation, did we not know that whatever merits this journal may have, as a Catholic journal, they are due not to us, but principally to the distinguished Bishop of this diocese, and his learned and venerable clergy, who have always been ready to instruct our ignorance, and to advise and direct us in the course proper for such a journal to pursue, and in the proper views to be taken of the several important theological questions we have discussed. To them pertain the merits of the Review; to us alone its faults and imperfections, which we hope will diminish with time and experience."—*July, 1849, p. 412.*

This extract goes to illustrate both sides of the relation, which it brings ostentatiously into view. The favor of the reigning priesthood is conditioned and reciprocated, by the unlimited obedience that is found basking in its sunshine. Mr. Brownson makes a point of being, in this respect, a Roman of the Romans, with whom no half-way measures can go down. His theory, from the start, is a sort of violent protestation against Protestantism, the absolute negative of all that this affirms, by which he

holds himself bound to part with his own independence altogether in matters of religion, and place his faith submissively in the hands of the Church, as an outward authority ordained of God for such purpose. The alternative with him is, law from within or law from without; one *or* the other, and one always so as to exclude the other; and having satisfied himself that the first, in such abstract view, runs out inevitably into rationalism and nihilism, he considers himself shut up to the necessity of accepting the opposite rule, as the only form in which it is possible to have part at all in a really supernatural religion. To this necessity, thus apprehended as a law of logic merely, Mr. Brownson, wearied and worn out with his own long attempt to find bottom in the miserable bog of a churchless independency, holds himself now bound, it would seem, as a rational man, to bring all his powers into subjection, cost what it may in any other view. Such an outward authority of the Church being granted to hold in any form as the necessary medium of faith, it follows plainly enough that the best claim to it lies with the Church of Rome. He is the best Christian, then, who most resolutely brings both his reason and will into captivity to the authority of this Church, as it is found embodied from age to age in the voice of its hierarchy. Having reached this conclusion, Mr. Brownson seems resolved to follow it to the death. He feels rightly enough, that if it be good for anything at all, it must be good for everything; as a well built arch is only made more firm and strong, by piling new weight upon its shoulders; and he is determined, accordingly, to let the world see that he has confidence in his own logic, and power also to bend his New England nature to its iron requisitions. As he tells us himself somewhere, his soul recoils from the mortal sin of being inconsequent, or holding premises which he is not prepared to follow out to their natural and necessary end. Has it become thus a maxim of reason with him, to obey with unquestioning faith the Roman Church? He will be *rational* then in such style, to the full end of the chapter. He will allow no sort of compromise with any rule besides. He will play the very *Yankee* himself in this new game; he will be a Puritan Romanist; making a king still of his own mind, and wilfully forcing his very will itself, to fall in with the new theory of faith he is thus brought to embrace. He will abjure philosophy in religion, and take all in the way simply of authority. It shall be his reason here to silence reasoning, and his will to have no freedom whatever. Thus firmly set in his own mind to follow out his new principle at all hazards, Mr. Brownson has had no trouble apparently in complying with even its

most extreme demands. He is at once a very ultramontanist, a downright Italian, in the plenitude of his obedience and faith, who can swallow even a camel, if need be, in the way of edifying example to less vigorous believers. Not content to affirm the infallibility of the Roman Church, he is willing to lodge this divine attribute, without farther ado, in the person of the ruling Pope.¹ He pays his devotions to the Virgin Mary, as though he had been born and bred to it in the natural way. He makes himself quite at home in the region of Roman Saints, legends, relics and miracles, as if he had been used to it all his life. At all times, and in all things, he carries himself most dutifully towards the priesthood, who form to his eyes the medium of all truth and authority in the Church, and from whose lips in such view the common layman is required to accept both without doubt or contradiction. His tone towards these spiritual superiors, as contrasted especially with the confidence and self-reliance he is accustomed to exhibit in other directions, is to affectation humble, we might almost say at times sycophantic and servile. "It would be presumptuous in us," he says in relation to Bishop Kenrick's work on the Primacy of the Apostolic See, "to speak of the doctrines set forth in this book, either to commend or to censure. The layman, because an editor or reviewer, is not relieved from his obligation to submit to his spiritual superiors, or to learn his faith from those the Holy Ghost has set in the Church to teach and to rule the flock. Yet on matters of private opinion, each man, whether layman or not, may entertain and express, reverently, his own opinions."—*April*, 1845, p. 263. So throughout. He is not simply a learner, but a passive receiver of theological knowledge, professedly, at the feet of the bishops and priests. He is careful to let us know, that in the conduct of his Review, he is to be considered, theologically, the echo simply of the proper masters of his faith, the bishop of Boston and his learned clergy. "The Catholic Church, faith and worship, as

¹ "The Papacy is the Church, the Pope the Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ on earth, and if you war against the Pope, it is either because you would war against God, or because you believe God can lie. If you believe God has commissioned the Pope, and that God will keep his promise, you must believe his authority is that of God, and can be no more dangerous than would be the authority of our Lord, were he present to exercise it in person."—*Jan.* 1847, p. 130.—"We copy below the *Encyclical Letter* of our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX. We have no room for comments, and should not offer any if we had. In it God speaks to us by his Vicegerent on earth, and it is ours to listen, believe, and obey."—*April*, 1847, p. 249. "Certainly, when the Pope decides, we submit, for we recognize his right to decide, and we believe his decisions are infallible."—*Jan.* 1846, p. 100.

they are, always have been, and always will be till the end of time, is what we have embraced, what we love, what we seek to defend, not relying on our own private judgment, but receiving the truth in humility from those Almighty God has commissioned to teach us, and whom he has commanded us to obey."

—Jan. 1846. p. 136. This is Romanism in full force; such as may be held to be fairly entitled to its reward, in the smiling approbation with which so many bishops and archbishops have seen fit to honor it before the world.

Mr. Brownson having thus violently given himself away to a theory of the Church which puts an end to all private thinking in religion, makes a merit apparently of the most violent consistency, in following it out to its most difficult consequences on all sides. The Christian salvation is for him a process that goes like clock-work. To his New England mind, the operation of the *machine* is all settled, as clearly as two and two make four, by the fixed nature of its pulleys and wheels. The maxim, *Out of the Church no salvation*, he applies at once to the Roman communion exclusively, and takes pains to shut out as much as possible every sort of hope in favor even of the best men beyond. Out of this Roman Church indeed, as his theory requires, he holds that there can be no act of true faith. Protestantism then, in its best shape, is a sham, that leans always towards open infidelity; and its virtues are to be counted hollow and deceitful, even where they may seem to carry the most pious and heavenly show. The Reformation was wholly without reason or necessity, and had its rise in worldly motives far more than in any true zeal for the glory of God. Luther and Calvin were bad men, and tools besides of men worse than themselves. The Church, as it stood before, was steadily moving in the right direction; while this revolution, so far as it prevailed, served only to hinder and embarrass the march of true christian improvement, causing the sun mark to go back on the dial plate of the world's civilization, God only knows how far. Protestantism rolls forward from the very start, by its own weight, to infidelity and nihilism. Its *life* is to be sought always on the side nearest this result, and not in its more respectable forms; for these are always more or less ossified and dead. Its only fair representation at this time accordingly, is found in transcendentalism, pantheistic atheism, and communism. Not only is the history of the Roman Church before the Reformation full of testimony to her divine character, as the patron and prop of all good in the world, whether in the form of religion, science, politics or social life; but her history *since* also, as compared with that of Protestantism, is powerfully suited to in-

culate the same lesson. The advantage often claimed in favor of Protestant nations, is more specious than solid.¹ Puritanism especially, here in America, is little more than a bag of wind.² Professor Park only raves, when he tell us that "Rome has trained a smaller number of original thinkers, for the last three hundred years, than have arisen from even half the number of Protestant churches." If the assertion mean, not soap bubble blowers, but men of solid learning, and clear as well as profound thought, Mr. Brownson denies it, and pledges himself, "after making all proper allowance for the excess of Catholic population over the Protestant, to produce ten Catholics to every one Protestant the Professor will bring forward."—1845, p. 495. "The Catholic cantons of Switzerland are more truly enlightened than the Protestant." Spain, Portugal, and Ireland, bear comparison favorably with Holland, Denmark, and Scotland.³ The laboring

¹ "We deny, positively deny, that in moral and intellectual science, properly so called, Protestants have made the least progress, or that their philosophers have ascertained a single fact or a single principle not known and recognized by the Schoolmen.—You talk of "the Dark Ages"—dark forsooth, as Coleridge, one of your own number, tells you, because you have not light enough to read them. We know something of your Protestant philosophers, and there are absolutely only four Protestant names, that it is not discreditable to one's own knowledge to call a philosopher, and it is doubtful if any one of these was really a Protestant. We mean Leibnitz, Kant, Hegel and Hobbes.—In theology you are as badly off as you are in philosophy. You have no more respectable theological work than Calvin's *Institutes*, which none of you now accept,—unless with a qualification.—Saving some branches of physical science, in which the progress effected is far less than is imagined, Protestants have really contributed nothing of any real importance to the progress of the human mind. We know the Protestant boasts, and we know what Protestants have done. Not one of the great inventions or discoveries, which have so changed the face of the modern world, with the exception, perhaps, of the mule and jenny, and a few other inventions in labor saving machinery, all of which we look upon as a curse, are due to them. Every thing degenerates, except material industry, in their hands; and yet, they have the singular impudence to accuse the Catholic Church of injuring the mind."—Oct. 1845, p. 492-494.

² "The literature of our country, such as it is, and it is nothing at best to boast of, we owe to authors not of the Puritan or Calvinistic school. The profoundest works of the Puritan school in this country are Edwards *on the Will*, and *on the Affections*, Hopkins' *System of Divinity*, and Dwight's *Theology*. The school does little else than republish from England and Scotland, translate from the German, or compile from foreign scholars. And yet our Puritan Professor, (Park,) with the tail of a Dutch goose in his cap for plume, steps boldly forward, and accuses Catholicity of being hostile to the mind, and seriously charges the Catholic Church with being deficient in great philosophers and eminent preachers."—Oct. 1845, p. 494.

³ "Not to Catholicity, but to the policy of England and the Church by law established, must we look for Ireland's degradation. We would willingly let the question itself turn on the instance of Ireland. We want no better evidence to prove the superiority of Catholicity over Protestantism."—1845, p. 496.

classes are much more degraded in England, than they are in Austria, in Italy, or in Spain. The Austrian clergy are not inferior to the Prussian, nor the Bavarian to the Saxon; and "to represent the present body of the French clergy, whether of the first or of the second order, as inferior to the English, betrays an ignorance or a recklessness that we were not prepared for even in our Andover Professor."—1845, p. 495-497. So everywhere. Mr. Brownson forces himself to see only evil in Protestantism, and in Romanism only goodness, beauty and grace. However black this last may seem to other eyes, it is still comely to his as the tents of Kedar or the curtains of Solomon. Out to Ireland and Mexico even, he is ready to say of it: *Thou art all fair, my love, there is no spot in thee.*"

Now to our mind, all this wholesale sweeping style is adapted to beget distrust, rather than to inspire confidence. It seems to involve a desperate determination to carry out a given theory, at all costs. Mr. Brownson's new orthodoxy sits on him with an air of stiff unnatural mannerism and constraint. It is too much a thing of logic and outward rule. It is so bent on being straight, that the very effort causes it to lean over from its own perpendicular. Its want of full inward security is betrayed, by the perpetual tendency it shows to assert itself in an extreme way.

The man draws enormously on our faith, who requires us to take the vast fact of the Reformation, with all its consequences down to the present time, as either a mere zero, or as something far worse than zero, in the history of the world and the Church. It comes before us, not as a side current simply in the stream of life, but as a force belonging plainly to its central channel. It had its ground and necessity in what went before. Whole ages looked towards it previously as their proper end. It is not more clear that the civilization of the modern world grew up in Europe, than it is that its growth and progress produced the Reformation. The fact carries in itself a universal significance, a force that reaches into politics, literature, and philosophy, as well as religion, and is capable thus of scientific exposition, as a necessary crisis in the course of Christianity. That it was in truth of such universal sense and force, is made evident by the vast agitations and changes that grew out of it in the sixteenth century, and the consequences, broad, mighty, and deep, that have continued to proceed from it down to the present time. Whatever our estimate may be of the worth of these, in themselves considered, it seems not possible for any sober mind to call in question their historical significance and moment. Protestantism, plainly, has not been an interlude simply, during the past three hundred years, in the

drama of the world's life. It belongs to the *history* of the period, in the fullest sense of the term. So far as the world can be said to have had a universal historical life at all, since the time of Luther, it must be acknowledged to have had its stream mainly in the line of Protestantism. Whether for weal or for woe, Protestant nations have taken the lead in the onward movement of humanity; and Protestant principles and interests have controlled, to a great extent, all its more prominent developments and positions. Unless, then, we choose to give up all faith in history, as a revelation of God's mind and will, we must bow before this great fact of three hundred years with earnest reverence, and admit that it has a meaning in it for the kingdom of God, in some way worthy of its vast proportions. Suppose the worst even in its case, that Protestantism, namely, is destined to prove a failure altogether, still it would be in the highest degree unphilosophical and irrational to deny its significance at least in this view, as the medium of transition for the Church to a better and brighter state, that could not have been reached without such a period of inward contradiction going before. The honor of God, the credit of religion, require that a movement which has so covered the field of history for so long a time, should in *some* form be acknowledged to carry with it a truly historical force, and to enter into the universal mission and plan of Christianity for the salvation of the world. If the space filled by Protestantism may be violently set aside as a blank in history, it would be hard to name any other period of equal duration which we might not as easily set aside in the same way. We ought to have no patience with men, who turn the first three centuries of Christianity into a sheer waste of sand, to suit their own miserable prejudices; and just as little too with those, who see only a long night of unmeaning desolation in the centuries that follow the downfall of the old Roman civilization; regardless, in the first case, of the world triumph by which Christianity was steadily conducted to the throne of the Cæsars, and in the second case, making no account of the no less magnificent new world triumph, which was accomplished in its mastery of the wild elements from which Europe draws its present life. Our faith in God, above all our reliance on Christ's special promise *not* to forsake his Church to the end of the world, will not allow us to acquiesce in the thought of any such vast hiatus or inorganic chaos in the history of Christianity. But why, we ask, should we have any more patience with this style of thinking, when we find it applied to the period since the Reformation, than we have for it as applied to the period before? Is it less arbitrary and pedantic, less frivolous and profane, to treat

the great fact of Protestantism, clearly belonging for three hundred years past to the central history of the world, as a nullity, a dream, the oversight of a sleeping Christ, than it is to look upon a like term of centuries a thousand years since, in the same dis-honorable light? The fact is too wide, too deep, too overwhelm-ingly significant, to be set aside in that way. Make Protestantism to be as bad as you please, still springing as it has done from the inmost depths of modern civilization, and filling as it does the middle channel of modern history, we are bound by all faith in God and in Christ, to hold it of necessary sense and value in some way, for the final triumph of Christianity under its true and right form. History here, as well as elsewhere, must be allowed to be *rational*, worthy of the Mind by which it is actuated, and not the sport simply of wild winds and waves. Christ, Head over all things to the Church, has not been asleep, nor out of the way, in the rise and progress thus far, of a movement so vast in its consequences. It is something monstrous, on the part of Mr. Brownson, then, that he affects to make such small account of Protestantism, and will not allow it to be of any historical significance whatever, for the last end of Christianity. Such an assumption is a great deal too violent; and for one who has come to have any sense at all of the divine character of history, over-throws itself, while it destroys at the same time the credit of the source from which it proceeds. Romanists must learn to find some sense, and not mere Devil's play, in the Reformation, if they expect to be heard respectfully in the scientific world in opposition to its claims. If Mr. Brownson should set himself to denounce and ridicule the Allegheny mountains or the Mississip-pi river, as useless or absurd accidents in nature, we do not see why it would be more reproachful to his philosophy and religion, than it is for him to put scorn in like style on the vast creations of history, that come before us during the past three hundred years in the form of Protestantism; for sure we are, that a con-tinent, shorn of its highest mountains and mightiest streams, would not miss its own universal sense more, than the tract of the world's general life must do, if the events of the last three hundred years were swept from the face of it as a mere imper-tinence or blank nothing.

Mr. Brownson however, is consistent with himself, and true also to the genius of his Church, in this violence offered to history. He abjures the true idea of history, and will not allow it to be of force for the period before the Reformation, any more than for the period following. History, in its very conception, implies progress; not fixed sameness, but unity in the form of

movement and change; the counterpart in time of what the manifold is in space, for an organic whole, as distinguished from mere number without unity. The sense of this is what we mean by historical feeling, and faith in history as the immanent force of a divine, and so of course supremely rational thought. But all such sense Mr. Brownson appears entirely to lack, or else resolutely to resist. History for him is no continuous living creation, that actualizes always more and more its own interior sense, and never falls away from a steady urgency towards its own last end; but a system rather of outward combinations and changes, over which God presides in a mechanical way, much at best as a chess player, whose business it is to keep the game in his own hands, through every new phase of the checkered board on which it is carried forward. The celebrated English convert, Mr. Newman, made an attempt to enlist the idea of *development*, which it is becoming so hard, in the face of modern science, for any truly scientific mind to withstand, in the service of the Roman Catholic Church. Against this pretension, however, it will be remembered, Mr. Brownson, a mere novice himself still in Romanism, but under the safe guidance of course of the powers above him, came out with the most determined contradiction and opposition. He saw and felt, correctly enough, that Romanism could not stand successfully on that ground; and he is to be acknowledged here, accordingly, a true and faithful expounder of its proper spirit and sense. Romanism is, by its very constitution, unhistorical. It lays claim indeed to history and tradition as wholly on its side, over against the abstract thinking that pretends to fetch all faith plump from the Bible; but the claim is overthrown by the fact, that it withdraws from history the idea of inward moving life, without which it has no title to its own name, and turns it thus into an existence, which is just as abstract on its own side, as the abstraction it pretends to fly from on the other. Romanism takes the truth of Christianity for an outward fact, entrusted for safe-keeping to its own hands, out of which it is to be dispensed of course in an outward way for the use of men in all ages. In this form, it must be taken to be perpetually the same, not simply as a living law in the life of the world itself, but as a formal deposit, also, and tradition in such outward style. Its history in such view, is that of a mountain, always the same through all changes of sun and storm that may play upon it from age to age. Only so, can the conception of its line-and-plummet infallibility be fairly carried through. Immense difficulties, it is true, lie in the way of this view, when we try to make it square with facts. Romanism, as it now stands, seems

to be anything but a facsimile of primitive Christianity, and the evidences of change may be said to meet us from almost every page of Church history. No two centuries appear to be alike. Still the theory requires it to be otherwise, and to this all facts must be made to bend, by violent hypothesis at least, if in no other way. Mr. Brownson has his fixed *idea* here, like every other good Romanist, and shows himself a perfect Hegelian in requiring it to underlie and rule the construction of history from first to last. The Church has been monotonously one and the same, if we are to take his word for it, from the beginning. Only error and heresy change; truth stands like a rock, against the face of which their rolling waves beat, age after age, without impression or effect. All Christian doctrines came forth from God full and complete in the beginning, and have been handed down by the Church, as an outward deposit, to the present time. The law of history is allowed to hold in other spheres of life. There is growth in nature. Humanity too, in its natural form, subsists by evolution and progress. Religion moreover meets us as a moving fact in the Old Testament. But all such growth contradicts, we are told, the proper conception of Christianity. Only sects here have any development; and then it is always away from the truth and against it.¹ Mr. Newman's theory is applicable to the sects, but not at all to the Church. "He forgets that she sprung into existence full grown, and armed at all points, as Minerva from the brain of Jupiter; and that she is withdrawn from the ordinary law of human systems and institutions by her supernatural origin, nature, character, and protection. If he had left out the Church, and entitled his book, *An Essay on the development of Christian Doctrine, when withdrawn from the Authority and supervision of the Church*, he would have written, with slight modifications, a great, and valuable book. It would then have been a sort of natural history of sectarism, and been substantially true. But applying his theory to the Church,

¹"Catholicity is immovable and inflexible, one and the same always and everywhere; for the truth never varies. He who knows it in one age or country, knows it in all. But with the sects it is far otherwise. They must needs obey the natural laws of development, strengthened and intensified by demoniacal influence. Their spirit and tendency, indeed, are always and everywhere the same, but their forms change under the very eye of the spectator, and are rarely the same for any two successive moments. Strike where Protestantism is, and it is not there. It is in perpetual motion, and exemplifies, so far as itself is concerned, the old heathen doctrine, that all things are in a perpetual flux. You can never count on its remaining stationary long enough for you to bring your piece to a rest and take deliberate aim. You must shoot it on the wing."—Oct. 1947, p. 417.

and thus subjecting her to the law which presides over all human systems and institutions, he has, unintentionally, struck at her divine and supernatural character. The Church has no natural history, for she is not in the order of nature, but of grace."—*July, 1846, p. 366.* This is sufficiently clear. Christianity has no history, and enters not into the law of time, as this holds of all human existence besides. It owes nothing to history, but in truth stands wholly on the outside of it, as an unvarying supernatural fact, preserved by mechanical tradition from the start exactly as it is now held and taught in the Roman Church. With such a theory, it is easy to set aside Protestantism as a nullity; just as false Protestantism on the other hand, finds it easy to set aside all that crosses its humor in the ancient Church; in the same way precisely, in both cases, that the facts of geology are shorn of all their force, for those who have no sense of what belongs to the organic constitution of nature, and think it enough simply to resolve all phenomena into the abstract fiat of Jehovah.

Here, however, Mr. Brownson stands on common ground, for the most part, with those who have entered the lists with him in this controversy; and it must be admitted that the advantage, in such view, falls altogether to his side. He will have it that it is only sectarianism, or dissent from Rome, that moves in the way of history. But our Protestant sects generally deny this. Rome has moved, they tell us, by apostacy and corruption; *they* represent the primitive faith, as we find it in the Bible. History, in the true sense, they reject and disown. Christianity must be accepted as "a full grown Minerva;" only not from the living Church, but from the written word; or as the Episcopalian take it, from the word and ancient tradition combined. It becomes necessary, accordingly, to assert and defend Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, or whatever else it may be, as the identical form of primitive Christianity, rightly of force for all ages, and to treat all intervening variations in Church history, as corruptions and aberrations from the truth. It is easy to see, however, that no form of modern Protestantism can successfully affirm its identity with primitive Christianity; if such identity be taken to stand in the same forms of Church thought and Church life. And if this be laid down as the necessary condition of ecclesiastical legitimacy, we see not truly how any effectual stand can be made, by any of these bodies, against the pretensions of Rome. Both sides claim divine right, in the same unhistorical way, in defiance of all historical difficulties, on the ground simply of abstract supernatural revelation. It needs of a truth a supernatural commission, to legitimate such a claim under such

circumstances. This Romanism pretends at least to show in favor of itself; while the opposite interest requires us to take in lieu of it, simply what is by confession its own merely human judgment and word. If Christianity be thus unhistorical, it is easier on the whole to accept it under the Roman form, than it is to be satisfied with it under any other. The theory still remains unreasonable and violent in its own nature; but it wins at least a relative apology, by being made to appear the necessary alternative of a scheme still more at war with reason than itself.

The false position thus taken by such unhistorical Protestantism, serves to entangle it in other wrong views, which it is not hard to turn to the advantage of the opposite side. In this way, candor constrains us to acknowledge, Mr. Brownson too often triumphs in argument over his opponents, not so much because he is himself absolutely right, as because they unhappily place themselves in the wrong.

In this warfare he wields a most active pen; not confining himself by any means, as some of his opposers might wish, to the business of parrying and warding off thrusts from the contrary side; but seeking rather to carry the main brunt of battle into the very heart of the enemy's country; fiercely assailing Protestantism in its own strongholds, and defying it to mortal combat where it is accustomed to look upon itself as most secure and strong. His attacks in this way have been renewed and repeated in various forms, particularly during the first two years after his conversion, according to the different aspects under which the war was to be met; for Protestantism, though a common interest in one view as opposed to Romanism, is still a divided interest within itself, that is not to be approached from all sides exactly in the same way. Mr. Brownson seemed to lay himself out systematically, from the start, for the demolition of its several divisions and sections in detail. We have him at one time, accordingly, directing his artillery against the pretensions of the High Church Episcopalians; then in an article on the British Reformers, against Bishop Hopkins, routing the theory of Low Church Episcopalians; then, against the Unitarian Examiner, exposing the vanity of the No-church theory, which admits the Church in name, but denies it in fact—a theory not confined by any means to Unitarians. Again we find him doing battle with Methodism, then with Presbyterianism, then with Congregationalism, then with Transcendentalism and Socialism, which form in his view the natural and proper end of the whole Protestant movement. In the midst however of all this variety of warfare, conducted in all these different directions with so much versatility

and spirit, the fundamental argument of Mr. Brownson against Protestantism remains always the same, and is capable of being reduced to comparatively narrow dimensions. He may be said thus to have exhausted the whole force of it in his first onset, or series of assaults, so that his later polemical articles involve necessarily, in this respect, a considerable amount of self-repetition, which for the intelligent reader can hardly fail to detract somewhat at times from their interest.

The course of reasoning, which thus underlies Mr. Brownson's whole faith in Romanism,¹ and to which we are continually referred as the ultimate argument in his manifold debates with Protestantism, may be reduced briefly to the following statement:

I. Christianity is a revelation made to men by God through his Son, Jesus Christ, in other words, "the truth which Jesus Christ taught or revealed." As such, it belongs, at least in part, to the *supernatural* order, transcends nature, comes from beyond the limits of human knowledge. It is something superadded to nature. "Grace, though having the same origin, is above the order of creation, is not included in it, nor promised by it. It is, so to speak, an excess of the Divine Fulness not exhausted in creation, but reserved to be superadded to it according to the Divine will and pleasure." In this form, it is indispensably necessary for our salvation, but can be apprehended only by faith, whose vocation and prerogative it is, as distinguished from science, thus to make us sure of what transcends sense and reason. The object of faith here must be the very truth itself of this supernatural revelation, and not something else in its stead. The problem of our salvation requires, that the supernatural, as revealed by Christ and transcending our knowledge, should be appropriated to our minds notwithstanding in the way of faith or sure belief, so as to act upon us with the reality which belongs to it in its own sphere.—II. "Faith, as distinguished from knowledge and science, rests on authority extrinsic both to the believer and to the matter believed. Knowledge is intuitive, finds its motives of assent in the subject or person knowing. Science is discur-

¹ "We had already convinced ourselves of the insufficiency of Naturalism, Rationalism, and Transcendentalism; we had also convinced ourselves of the necessity of Divine revelation and of the fact that the Christian revelation was such a revelation. From this, by a process of reasoning which may be seen in the first article of this number, we arrived infallibly at the Catholic Church. The process is simple and easy. It requires no metaphysical subtlety, no long train of metaphysical reasoning. All it needs is good common sense, a reverent spirit, and a disposition to believe on sufficient evidence."—April, 1845, p. 262.

sive, finds its motives of assent in the object or thing known. "But in belief I must go out of myself, and also out of the object, for my motives of assent." It rests on *testimony*. All turns then of course on the authority or credibility of the witness, extrinsically considered. The supernatural cannot be attested or made sure in this way by any merely natural witness; but only by supernatural authority, that is, by God himself. Nothing less than Divine testimony can be a sufficient ground for faith in what transcends nature. This however, we may rationally trust in such case, if we have it; "because enough is clearly seen of God from the creation of the world, and understood by the things that are made, to establish on a scientific basis the fact that he can neither deceive nor be deceived; for we can *demonstrate scientifically*, from principles furnished by the light of natural reason, that God is infinitely wise and good, and no being infinitely wise and good can deceive or be deceived." But now to place our faith in contact truly with the authority of God, in the case of a Divine revelation, the fact of the revelation must be authenticated to us by a competent witness, and also the true sense of it made certain in intelligible propositions; for if it be a question whether the revelation is really from God, or if it be taken in a wrong or doubtful sense, there can be no apprehension of God's testimony as it is, in the case, and so no apprehension through this of the supernatural to which it bears witness, "Faith in the supernatural requires, then, in addition to the witness that vouches for the fact that God has made the revelation, an interpreter competent to declare the true meaning of the revelation." And as faith is required in all times and places, these necessary conditions of its exercise must be no less universal, at hand for all nations and through all ages, and of unmistakable authority for the poor and illiterate as well as for the high and learned. The witness and interpreter, moreover, must be *infallible*. Faith is a theological virtue, which consists in believing, without doubting, what God has revealed, on the veracity of God alone. "He who has for his faith only the testimony of a fallible witness, who may both deceive and be deceived, has always a reasonable ground for doubt, and therefore no solid ground for faith. Therefore, since, with a fallible witness, or fallible interpreter, we can never be sure that we are not mistaken, it follows, if we are to have faith at all, we must have a witness and interpreter that cannot err, therefore infallible."—III. As God requires faith in his word, in order to salvation, and this can have no place without the conditions now mentioned, we are bound to believe that these conditions *sine qua non* are by him provided for this

end. Where then is the infallible witness and interpreter of God's word, thus indispensable to the exercise of faith in what it reveals, to be sought and found. It is not *reason*, whether as intuitive or discursive. It is not the *Bible*; because this itself needs to be authenticated and interpreted by some infallible authority beyond itself. It is not *private illumination*; for that at best would give only a private faith, while what we are required to have is a public faith, such as can be sustained by public evidence, by arguments which are open to all and common to all. "No witness, then, remains to be introduced but the Apostolic ministry, or *Ecclesia docens*." Either this, or we have no witness.—IV. This conclusion is abundantly supported and made good also, in the way of historical fact. "The ministry is the organ through which Jesus Christ *supernaturally* bears witness to his own revelation." It is infallible, not in virtue of what it is naturally, but by his supernatural presence. Such supernatural qualification or competency might seem to be a fact itself requiring again supernatural witness; but it is not so; the credibility of the witness may be "supernaturally established to natural reason by means of miracles." A miracle connects the natural and supernatural, "so that natural reason can pass from the one to the other. Natural reason can determine whether a fact be or be not a miracle; and if it be so, can conclude from it legitimately to the supernatural cause, and to the Divine commission or authority of him by whom it is wrought. The miracle is God's own assurance to natural reason, that he speaks in and by the person who performs it; in which case we have the veracity of God for the truth of, what the miracle-worker declares, and therefore infallible certainty; for God can neither deceive nor be deceived. So then the process of proof for the fact before us, namely the infallible authority of the *Ecclesia docens*, is simple and easy." The miracles of Christ, historically certified or made sure for natural reason, are sufficient to accredit his Divine commission," and authorize the conclusion that whatever he said or promised was infallible truth; for whether you say Jesus was himself truly God as well as truly man, or that he was only divinely commissioned, you have in either case the veracity of God as the ground of faith in what he said or promised. Suppose then the fact that Jesus Christ appointed a body of teachers, and promised to be always with them to make them infallible, and suppose also this fact made infallibly certain to natural reason, by proper historical evidence; have we not, in such case, infallible certainty that Jesus Christ does speak in and through this body, and that it is absolutely secure thus from error in all

it believes and teaches? Here we have recourse to the New Testament, which as a simple historical document may be infallibly clear for private reason alone, in *some* of its contents, though not in the whole. In Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20, Mark xvi. 15, Eph. iv. 11, we have the well known apostolical commission; which is declared to reach to the end of the world, and to have regard to all nations. In such view, it requires and implies a corporation or body, always identical with itself. This is the *Ecclesia docens*, which with such constitution must be considered corporately infallible, and whose voice all men consequently are bound to obey as the voice of God.—V. Where now is this corporate ministry to be found, at the present time. It cannot be in the Greek communion; still less in the Protestant. It is then the Roman Catholic ministry; because it can be found nowhere else, and because also its regular succession can be clearly identified here from the beginning. “Then we sum up by repeating, that Jesus Christ has instituted and commissioned an infallible and indefectible body of teachers, and this body is the congregation of the Roman Catholic pastors in communion with their chief. The Catholic Church then is the witness to the fact of revelation. What its pastors declare to be the word of God, is the word of God; what they enjoin as the faith, is the faith without which it is impossible to please God, and without which we are condemned and the wrath of God abideth on us. What they teach is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; for God himself has commissioned them, and will not suffer them to fall into error in what concerns the things they have been commissioned to teach.” Out of this Church, of course, no act of faith can take place; for faith is a theological virtue, which can be elicited only in obedience to God’s authority, propounding truth in a supernatural and also public way; which we have only in the body of pastors, and teachers belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. See the article particularly entitled, *The Church against No-Church*.—April, 1845; also *The British Reformation* in the same volume; *Faith not Possible without the Church*.—Jan., 1846; *The Two Brothers, or why are you a Protestant*.—July, 1847; &c., &c.

The main force of this reasoning lies in this, that the view maintained is made to appear the only and necessary alternative to another view, starting from the same premises, which is found to be irrational and untenable. In both cases, Christianity is taken to be a revelation of supernatural truth, which men are to receive by faith, as something wholly out of themselves, that is brought near to them for their use in a purely outward way.

As it has its source and seat beyond their proper nature altogether, so it cannot be allowed to find in this any rule or measure whatever for its apprehension. It must be taken as a matter of mere authority. The relation between the receptivity of faith on the one side, and the propounded truth on the other, the subject natural and the object supernatural, is held to be in no sense inward and living, but mechanical only and juxtapositional, the one remaining always on the outside of the other. How now is the necessary connection between the two to be mediated, so as to secure for faith a real possession of the heteronomic supernatural? We take it only on God's testimony; God is true, and we may rationally trust his word, if we have it, in so great a case. Very good; agreed so far on all sides. Now comes however another question. How are we to be sure that God has spoken in the first place, and then in the next place that we have his very mind or sense in what he has spoken? It is not enough here to send us to the Bible; the question still returns, How do we know that the Bible is his word, and how are we to ascertain the mind of the Spirit in what it teaches? Inspiration is itself something supernatural, of which faith needs to be infallibly assured, in order that it may be infallibly sure of what it reveals. Here however a certain system of thought, which claims to be Protestantism, although it is not Protestantism in its true and genuine sense but a corruption of it rather on the side towards Rationalism, is ready at once to respond: "We need no infallible witness to assure us of the revelation, other than the inspired Bible itself; the proofs of its divinity lie open to reason, and every man may there get the mind of God out of it for himself." But with the theory of revelation before noticed, by which it is taken to be wholly outward and transcendent, and which resolves faith into an assent to grounds which are extrinsic both to the object and the subject, and to be found only in an authority that lies between, it is plain that this short method of settling the matter must land us at last in something very like infidelity itself. It is in truth to subordinate the supernatural to the natural, and to make the private reason of every man the seal and certification of God's oracles, sounded forth from a world which has this same reason wholly on its outside. To say "Man needs no revelation, but only the full development of his nature;" and to say: "He may by his nature assure himself infallibly that he has a revelation on the outside of him, and also make out what it means in the same outward view;" are declarations that come to very much the same result in the end. In either case we have substantial rationalism, or a faith that has to do immediately and really, not

with the supernatural at all in its own kind, but only with the natural shoved in as a supposed intermediate witness in its name and stead. Faith becomes a conclusion of logic, and not the substantiation of things invisible, immediately and directly, as they are in their own nature. The case labors under a twofold difficulty. First, the merely individual judgment is made to be the measure of truth, without regard to the claims of mind in its general character; which is in contradiction to the idea of humanity itself, as it comes before us on all other sides. Private judgment, like private will, has no force of reason ever *as private*, but becomes rational only by ceasing to be private and showing itself to be truly general. Then again, if it *could* be regarded as sufficient and complete, it must still be held of no power to bridge over effectually, in a real way, the impassable gulph by which it is here taken to be sundered from the object, of which faith needs to be infallibly certified and assured. The theory of the *Bible and Private Judgment* then, under this abstract form, cannot possibly bear examination. It is not only false, but pernicious to the very life of faith. It runs at last into mere naturalism and rationalism. Over against it, the argument for the idea of the Church, the claims of Christianity in its universal or catholic and historical character, and the necessity of a truly Divine certification or witness of supernatural truth for faith, is overwhelmingly conclusive. Without all this, Christianity has no power to save its proper divine credit. The alternative is, faith in this form or infidelity.¹ Romanism thus far is fully in the right; and if it can cause it to appear that its own theory, as exhibited by Mr. Brownson, is the only way of escape from what is thus opposed, we must feel ourselves bound certainly, as we fear God and value his salvation, to throw ourselves into its arms.

At present, however, we do not see this theory to be such a necessary way of escape from the ruinous system it so justly condemns on the opposite side. On the contrary, it seems to us intrinsically defective in its own constitution, as being nothing less in truth than the reverse side of that same bad system itself; which as such is found, on close inspection, to labor under substantially the same difficulty and contradiction. Here, as there, the difficulty is again of a double sort. The general is made to

¹ We propose to take up this subject again, some time hereafter, in the way of a review of two interesting and profound tracts by the justly celebrated Dr. Owen, on the *Reason of Faith* and the *Causes, Ways and Means of understanding the mind of God as revealed in his word*.

exclude the individual, as there the reverse ; in contradiction to the idea of humanity, as we find it in the natural world. And then, as before, no real bridge is made to span the gulph that divides the visible from the invisible. Both views are alike in this, that they make faith to rest on a conclusion of mere natural reason, and will not allow the supernatural, as such, to come by means of it into any real union with the natural. We will try to make our meaning clear, as regards Romanism, by the following general observations, in the way of criticism on Mr. Brownson's argument in its defence.

I. The theory involves a general wrong against our human constitution, naturally considered, inasmuch as it will not allow its ordinary law of freedom to have force in the sphere of religion, which is that precisely in which it is required to make itself complete. The general law of our nature is that mind must fulfil its mission, not by following blindly a mere outward force of any sort, but by the activity of its own intelligence and will, both as general and individual. It must move in the light that springs from itself, and by the power it generates continually from within. This moral constitution includes complex relations, laws, organic interdependence, action and reaction, as in the world of nature, on a vast and magnificent scale. Still to the idea of it as a whole the conception of freedom appertains, in the form now stated, as a necessary universal distinction. The theory of Mr. Brownson however, if we rightly understand it, requires us to assume that in the highest form of religion, that which is reached in Christianity, the human mind ceases to be directly active in the accomplishment of what is brought to pass in its favor, and is a passive recipient simply of foreign action brought to bear on it in an outward way. It does not help the matter, that it is taken to be active with regard to Christianity in a different sphere ; the difficulty is that no activity is allowed to it in the realization of Christianity itself, as the highest fact of the world. Christianity claims to be the perfection of man's life ; this, in its ordinary constitution, unfolds itself by its own self-movement, in the way of thought and will ; but just here all this is superseded by another law altogether ; the supernatural comes in as the outward complement of the natural, in such sort as to make the force of this last null and void in all that pertains to its higher sphere.

II. This wrong against human nature becomes most immediately plain, in the violence which the individual mind is made to suffer, by the theory, in favor of what is taken to be general. The existence of truth is objective, and in such view of course

universal and independent of all private thought or will ; but as thus objective it must be at the same time subjective, must enter into particular thought and will, in order to be real. As object merely, without subject, it becomes a pure abstraction. Mere single mind can never be, in and by itself, the measure of either truth or right ; it must be ruled, and so bound, by the objective or the authority of the general. On the other hand, however, the general as such, mere law or object, is no such measure either, in and by itself ; to be so, it must take concrete form in the life of the world, which resolves itself at last into the thinking and willing of single minds. But now, in the case before us, Romanism sets aside the authority of this order, which is found to be of such universal force for the constitution of our nature in every other view. Christianity is taken to be of force for the world under a simply abstract form ; an outwardly supernatural revelation, transcending the whole order of our common life, and not needing nor allowing the activity of man himself, as an intelligent and free subject, to be the medium in any way of its presence and power. Authority is made to be all, and freedom nothing. The authority too is cut off and sundered from the proper life of the subject, and in this way comes to no real union with his intelligence and will. It comes from abroad, stands over him in an outward way, and requires him to submit to it as a foreign force. Authority thus is not mediated at all by man's actual life ; is in no sense living and concrete, but altogether mechanical, rigid, and fixed. It is from the start a given quantity, just so much, and nothing either more or less. It excludes private thought and will, according to Mr. Brownson. "The two authorities," that of private thought and that of the Church, "may indeed co-exist," we are told, "but not in regard to the same matters; for one is the negation of the other." The right of private judgment is taken to be of force only where the authority of the Church ceases ; as though each had its own territory separate from that of the other, without the possibility ever of any truly common jurisdiction. "To assume the authority of both private judgment and the Church on the same matters, is absurd. One authority necessarily excludes the other. If it is private judgment, then not the Church ; if the Church, then not private judgment." The office of reason ends, where authority begins. "We accept private judgment, as well as the Bishop (Hopkins), and give full scope to the individual reason, but only within its legitimate province. We reconcile reason and authority by ascertaining the province of reason, and confining it within its legitimate province. Questions of reason are to be decided

by reason, but questions of faith are to be decided by authority ; for all faith rests on authority, and would not be faith if it did not." See article on the *British Reformation*.—Jan. 1845. Authority may override private reason, and make it null. Its teachings and commands, in the case of the Church, "constitute the rule of truth and falsehood, right and wrong, good and evil. It is no matter what you prove she teaches and commands ; for if it be clear that she teaches and commands it, we will maintain that it is true, right, and good, against all gainsayers, even to the dungeon, exile, or the stake, if need be." Articles of faith are first principles, or axioms in religion, over which "reason has no natural rights, never had any, never can have any ; because they lie out of her province, and belong to the supernatural, where her authority does not extend." So again : "The articles of faith are not taken from the dominions of reason, but they are certain grants made gratuitously to her, extending, instead of abridging, her authority, and therefore serve instead of injuring her."—Oct. 1845, p. 448-451. This, and a great deal more to the same purpose, shows clearly enough the relation in which Mr. Brownson makes faith stand to reason ; and so the view he takes of authority, or the claims of the general, as related to the rights of the individual mind. He sees rightly enough that a purely unbound freedom, liberty without law, is the very conception of slavery itself ; but does not stop to take into view the other side of the truth, this namely, that a purely bound authority, law without liberty, is slavery also. "Liberty to hold and teach," he tells us, "what the Sovereign Pontiff says we may, is all the liberty we ask ;" for this is liberty to obey God's law, the only liberty he allows to any man. "Law is the basis of liberty, and where there is no sovereign authority there is no law. Liberty is not in being free of all law, but in being held only to the law. We believe the Church, and the Pope as visible head of the Church, is the organ through which Almighty God promulgates the law. Consequently, in our own estimation at least, in submitting to the Pope, we find, instead of losing our liberty."—Jan. 1846, p. 101. Good. No law, no liberty. But still, the planet is not free in being true simply to the law that carries it round the sun ; and the animal is not free, that follows the law of its own instincts. Law here is not enough. It must be met by the spontaneity of a free subject, which with the power to go aside from its orbit, makes the law notwithstanding the very form of its own action, producing its authority purely and truly from within. Certainly, the theory before us is ready to say, the law must be obeyed freely, by the option and choice of the obeying

subject ; but this requires no autonomy of the subject, in the constitution of the law, no voice in its legislation ; all the case demands or allows, is that on grounds extrinsic wholly to its constitution the subject be rationally persuaded that obedience is wise and right. Is this however, more at last, we ask, than mere prudence, or a skilful calculation of profit and loss ? Is the man free who obeys the law, *Thou shalt not kill*, to avoid the gallows ? Is it liberty to say white is black or black white, though it should be said never so pleasantly and glibly, because we are required to do so by an authority which we feel it unsafe to resist ? Am I free when I renounce my own intelligence and will, and accept in their place another measure of truth altogether *in no union whatever with my personal reason*, whether from the hand of an earthly prince to buy political distinction, or from the hand of a pope to buy a place in heaven ? Freedom is more, a great deal, than any such outward consent to the authority of law. It is life *in* the law, union with it, the very form in which it comes to its revelation in the moral world. Place the law as an objective force on the outside wholly of the intelligence and will of those who are to be its subjects, and at once you convert it into an abstract nothing. This is the natural extreme of Romanism. Against it, the Reformation formed a legitimate and absolutely necessary reaction and protest. It is quite in the order of history, that this protest should itself lead again to extreme results on the opposite side, making the subjective everything and the supernatural objective next to nothing. But the cure for this is not just the old error ; and however much of force there may be in Mr. Brownson's polemics, as directed against Parkerism, Socialism, and Pseudo-protestantism universally, (a force which *we* have no wish certainly to deny or oppose.) it does not follow by any means that Protestantism, as simply opening the way for such abuse, is to be considered unsound and false from the start ; just as little as the abuses of Popery show the Catholic truths to be false, from which they can be shown to have taken their rise. It is still as true now, as it was at the beginning of the sixteenth century, that the *actualization* of truth in the world, is something which can be accomplished only through the medium of intelligence and will on the part of the world itself ; that liberty, in its genuine sense, is not simply the outward echo of authority, but the very element of its life, and the co-efficient of its power, in that which it brings to pass ; that man is no passive machine merely in the business of his own salvation ; that the free activity of the individual subject in the world of mind, never can be paralyzed or overwhelmed by the sense of law, as a

nature foreign and transcendent wholly to its own nature, without such bondage as involves in the end the overthrow of reason altogether.

The force of this position does not depend on the kind of authority, that is to be obeyed. Whether it be divine or human is all the same thing, if it is taken to be something wholly on the outside of the subject, in no way congenerous with his natural constitution, a law beyond his own reason altogether and foreign from his life. It is not in such view, that God exercises authority. His will is never arbitrary, and so never abstract. Where it touches men, it forms in truth the inmost and deepest reason always of their own being; and in such view, though it may not be fully comprehensible, and though it could never have been dreamed of without supernatural revelation, still it must be allowed, even to the mystery of the Blessed Trinity itself, to carry in itself such an organic agreement with the world's life as otherwise known, and such a felt suitableness to the demands of reason, as may serve to evidence its rationality at least afar off, and create thus a presumption in its favor from the start. It will not do to say, that reason is absolutely passive in the reception of what is propounded by Divine authority; in such way, for instance, that it would be as easy to allow five persons in the Godhead as it is to allow three, or that a Hindoo avatar might be believed as fully as the Christian Incarnation, on the strength simply of God's outward word. It may be said indeed, and with truth also, that to be sure of God's word in the case is to be sure of the intrinsic rationality of what it is thus supposed to proclaim; but this just shows, that we *cannot* be sure of his word without some regard to the intrinsic reasonableness of what it propounds, and that this itself accordingly is ever to be taken as part of the evidence for the other fact. In other words, the authority of the revelation is not abstract and foreign wholly from the nature of the life, for which it is made. Our difficulty here with Mr. Brownson, then, is not just that he arms the Pope with divine authority, whereas he might seem to be only a common man; but that such authority, in the hands of the Pope or anywhere else, should be taken to supersede and nullify so completely the true idea of human freedom. The theory rests on a wrong conception of what authority is in the world of mind, and so on a wrong conception of the true nature of the Church, as the divinely constituted organ and bearer of Christ's will among men, (as we too take it to be,) to the end of time.

III. For as already intimated in some measure, the necessary result of such a separation of liberty and law, the rights of the

subjective and the claims of the objective, is vast wrong in the end to the second of these interests as well as to the first. The true idea of authority in the moral world, requires that it should come to its revelation, under a concrete form, through the medium of the general life and in the way of history. With the theory of Mr. Brownson, however, all this fails. The Church is taken to be the infallible witness of God's mind in the Christian revelation; but not in virtue of her living wholeness as the Body of him that filleth all in all, her life serving in such universal form, as the natural medium for unfolding the full sense of its own contents; all this is precluded by the conception of an abstract ministry, or *ecclesia docens*, on which the gift of infallibility is conferred in a purely outward supernatural way. This gift is not mediated at all, in any way, by the life of the Church as a whole. The *ecclesia docens* is no organic product and outbirth of the new creation generally, which it is appointed to serve. Its prophetical, priestly and kingly functions, are not the activity of Christ's mystical body working itself forth collectively in such form, by appropriate organs created for the purpose. The ministry rather is independent of the Church; it has a life of its own; it is a separate organization, through which the higher powers of Christianity are carried forward, by a wholly distinct channel, for the use of the world from age to age. These higher powers too belong to it in a mechanical, magical way, and not according to the ordinary law of truth and power among men. It is objected to Mr. Newman, that he makes the general mind of the Church the medium of christian knowledge. "This view, if followed out," we are told, "would suppress entirely the proper teaching authority of the Church, competent at any moment to declare infallibly what is the precise truth revealed; or at least would raise the *ecclesia credens* above the *ecclesia docens*, and reduce the office of the Church teaching to that of defining, from time to time, the dogmatic truth which the Church believing has gradually and slowly worked out from her implicit feelings. The secret supernatural assistance would then attach to the Church believing, and superintend the elaboration, rather than to the Church teaching; and if to the Church teaching at all, only so far as to enable it faithfully to collect and truly define what the Church believing elaborates."—*July, 1846, p. 354.* There is no room with this view, of course, for the conception of anything like a progressive actualization of the life of the Church, in the form of authority. As the infallibility which belongs to her is independent of her natural constitution, abstract and not concrete, so it lies also wholly on the outside of her proper hu-

man presence in the world. To be out of history, is to be out of humanity. All this is encumbered with difficulty. We find no clear account of it in the New Testament. What is said there of the Church and its ministry, leads of itself to no such conception. The two forms of existence are exhibited rather as one; the second proceeding organically from the first; the entire constitution holding moreover under the character of life, real human life, in unity with itself throughout. It is not easy again, to withstand the universal analogy of the actual world in favor of the same view. Humanity, in all other cases, accomplishes its destiny by organic co-operation, carried forward in the form of history. Truth is brought to pass for it, through the medium of its own activity, the whole working towards its appointed end by the joint ministry of the parts, in such a way however, as to be something more always than these separately taken. So it is in the sphere of science; so in the sphere of art; so in the sphere of politics and social life. In each case, we have association, organization, historical movement; intercommunity of powers and functions; in one direction activity to guide and rule, in another direction activity to obey and follow; but this distinction conditioned by the life of the corporation itself in its whole character, and so always more or less free and flowing, not fixed by arbitrary ordination from abroad. The same law is allowed to have place in the sphere of religion too, beyond the precincts of Christianity. Even Judaism, we are told, was not exempt from its operation. But in the sphere of the Church, as it stands since Christ, we are required to take all differently. As a supernatural constitution, it must not conform to the order of nature. It must be neither organic, nor historical, nor human, in its higher life; but one long monotony rather of mere outward law and authority, superseding the natural order of the world, and contradicting it, age after age, to the end of time. The Roman system carries in itself thus a constant tendency to resolve the force of Christianity into magic, and to fall into the snare of the mere *opus operatum* in its bad sense. It must be confessed, at all events, that the theory, right or wrong, labors here under a difficulty, which it is by no means easy for a truly thoughtful mind to surmount.

IV. This brings us to notice more particularly, in the next place, the general relation in which the supernatural is taken by this system to stand to the natural, and its corresponding view of divine revelation. The two worlds are held to be wholly disjoined and separate the one from the other, so that any connection which is formed between them is regarded as outward only and not in

the way of common life. The truth with which faith has to do belongs to the "supernatural order," which transcends altogether, we are told, the order of nature; holds out of it, above it and beyond it; and cannot come to any organic union with it, under its own form. The two worlds are sundered by an impassable gulph, as regards inward constitution and being; only by the word of God, as an outward report, it is possible for faith, in the sphere of nature, to be infallibly assured of what lies beyond in a higher sphere.¹ This abstract conception of the supernatural, as something that refuses utterly to flow into one life in any way with the natural, may be said to underlie the whole theory of Romanism, as we find it set forth by Mr. Brownson; and it is of so much the more force to lend it plausibility, as it is for substance very generally accepted as correct, only with a less broad application, by those who are most forward to oppose the pretensions of this system as vain and false. Much of our Protestant orthodoxy, it must be confessed, rests on precisely the same abstract supernaturalism, in the view it takes of the Bible as the medium of divine revelation; without seeing that from such premises we are shut up at last, without help or escape, to the Romanist conclusion; since if the matter of revelation be wholly without self-evidencing power for faith, and such that it can be received on the ground of outward divine authority or testimony only, it follows plainly that we need also an infallible outward witness in the Church, to assure us in like mechanical style

¹ We have a strong assertion of such *transcendence* in the article, "Natural and Supernatural."—Jan. 1847, p. 110, 111, in reply to the allegation of an opponent that man's capacity of knowing God, as far as it goes, can be only through kindred powers. "Why could not Newton's dog know Newton? Because he had not the kindred powers." Mr. Brownson accepts the case as in point, and turns it to his own use. The dog *did* know his master within the range of a dog's nature; but not in the order in which Newton transcended this; "no one can know naturally above the order of his nature," and so no one can know naturally the supernatural. But will the objector deny, asks Mr. B., "that Almighty God, if he had chosen, could, by a special act of his power, have so elevated the dog's powers as to have enabled him to know his master in the full sense in which one man may know another?" And so the mind of man may be supernaturalized, by the gift of faith, into a capacity for apprehending the supernatural; while all this implies no fitness in his nature previously for any such apprehension. But is not this now, we ask, to set the higher sphere wholly on the outside of the lower, and to make the translation from the second to the first a simple miracle? The dog, to ascend into the order of man's life, must be *essentially* changed, created over again altogether; and if the supernatural entering man's life be a like process, it must be virtually his demolition and the construction of a new being, by Divine fiat, in his place.

where this authority is really and truly at hand. The reasonableness of faith turns not at all, according to this school, on any correspondence in which it stands directly with its own contents, but purely and exclusively on its relation to the extrinsic authority on which they are accepted as true. The principle, that we must judge the speaker by the word, however sound within the sphere of nature, is taken to involve infidelity, or at least a strong leaning to it, when adopted in the sphere of religion; "for it cannot be adopted in the sphere of religion without first denying, that in religion there is anything to be believed which transcends natural reason; therefore it cannot be adopted without denying supernatural revelation; and to deny supernatural revelation is what is meant by infidelity."—*Oct. 1845, p. 510.*

It might seem enough to convict this theory of error, so far as the Bible is concerned, that this bears on the face of it throughout clear proof of a real union of the supernatural with the natural, in the persons of the sacred writers. The truth it reveals is conditioned in the form of its manifestation always, by the mind and education of the men who give it utterance, and through them by the living human relations in the midst of which they stood. No two prophets think alike or speak alike. Their inspiration then is no abstraction, no divine mechanism, but something that truly descends, with all its divinity, into the order of nature. And what shall we say of Him, in whom all prophecy and inspiration became at last complete? Was it his office simply to stand between the two worlds that met in his person, and report *mysteries* over from one to the other, for the use of faith, in a purely outward way? What is meant then by the declaration: The *Word* became *Flesh*, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. Surely if the gospel means anything, we have here at least the supernatural order linked in real organic union with the natural, and showing thus the capacity of this last, as well as its need, to receive into itself such higher life as its own proper complement and end. It will not do, in the face of such a fact as the *Incarnation*, to say that the realities with which faith has to do in distinction from reason are wholly without light or evidence for this last in their own nature, and as such to be taken on the mere authority of God ascertained in some other way; in such sense that a man might be supposed to be infallibly sure first that he has this authority to go upon, and so be prepared to accept any and every proposition as true, on the strength of it, with equal readiness and ease. What is revelation, if it be not the actual entrance of the supernatural in some way over into the sphere of the natural? That which remains wholly beyond the orb of man's life, naturally considered, and in no living contact with it at any point, cannot be said surely to be revealed at all for his

apprehension and use. All revelation, as distinguished from magic, implies the self-exhibition of God, in a real way, through the medium of the world in its natural form. To a certain extent, we have such a revelation in the material universe. The outward creation is the symbol, mirror, shrine and sacrament, of God's presence and glory, as a supernatural fact, in the most actual way. The word of prophecy and inspiration is the gradual coming forth of eternal truth into time, in a like real way, through the medium of human thought and speech; a process, which completes itself finally in the full domiciliation, we may say, of the Infinite Word itself in the life of the world by Jesus Christ. It is an utterly unevangelical conception of this fact, to think of Christ only as an outward teacher or reporter of secrets, belonging to another order of existence wholly from that in which he appeared among men. Such a conception involves in fact the old Gnostic imagination, by which the supernatural side of his existence was never allowed to come to any really inward and organic union with its natural or simply human side; in consequence of which this last became always a phantom, and the first at the same time an extra-mundane abstraction. In Christ, most literally and truly, the supernatural order came to a living and perpetual marriage with the order of nature; which it could not have done, if the constitution of the one had not been of like sort with that of the other, (man made in the image truly of God,) so as to admit and require such union as the last and only perfect expression of the world's life. It lies then in the nature of the case, that Christ can be no abstraction, no solitary portent, in the midst of the world. If his incarnation involved a real entrance into its life at all, (and not simply an avatar, whether for an hour or for ten thousand years,) it must stand in living inward relation, and this fundamental too and central, with its entire organization and history under every other view. The lines of truth must fall in upon it as their necessary centre, from all sides, out to the farthest periphery of nature. It must be found to carry in it the inmost and deepest sense of the universal sphere to which it belongs. It is a fact therefore which must come harbingered and heralded by voices from the deep, and long shadows thrown before, signs, prophecies, and types, from every quarter; all made clear at last indeed only by the event itself; whilst with equal necessity, the powers of history may be expected to throw themselves subsequently, always more and more, into its train, the world before and the world behind joining thus in one and the same loud acclamation: "Hosannah to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name

of the Lord!" But now, if this be the relation of the supernatural in Christ himself to the sphere of nature, it is not easy certainly to acquiesce in any theory of the Church, by which this is taken to be the medium of divine revelation in a wholly different style. An abstract Church, is as much at war with the true mystery of Christianity, as an abstract Christ. The Church, according to Mr. Brownson, is the infallible witness of God's word, not in the way of any really human mediation in the case, but in a wholly outward and unearthly way, by a special fiat of grace investing it with such infallibility, as a fixed mechanical fact, in no union whatever with the laws of our life under its ordinary form.¹ This we find it by no means easy to admit. The view works back unfavorably on the whole idea of revelation; and especially wrongs, in the end, the character of Jesus Christ. We are very far from believing, that the divinity of a revelation turns on its having no common life with humanity; on the contrary it seems to us to become complete, in proportion precisely as the supernatural, by means of it, is brought to enter most fully and truly into the conditions of the natural.

V. The theory carries with it finally, as it seems to us, a wrong conception of the true nature and power of faith, involving in the end the very consequence it seeks professedly to shun, namely the subordination of faith to reason or its resolution into mere logic. It goes on the assumption that the supernatural, with which faith has to do, is so sundered from the natural, as to admit no direct approach or apprehension from that side; that truth in such form is inevident for the mind wholly in its own nature, and without force of reason intrinsically to engage its assent; that the mind is moved to such assent in its case accordingly, not by any motives either in itself or in the object set before it, but by something extrinsic to both, the weight of an

¹ Mr. Brownson sees the Church always as an order extrinsical to the life of nature, or to humanity in its own proper form. Human institutions, he admits, allow a mixture of good and bad; but the Church, he will have it, is no *human* institution. "If Christian, she is divine—for Christ is God; and then she is not a *human* institution, unless God and man are identical;" and so she must be taken as only and wholly true, right, and good.—*July*, 1849, p. 310. But Christianity in the individual believer is divine too; does it then make *him* to be also free from all error and sin? Even an apostle, it seems, might do wrong. And is the Church in fact so good, as to be literally *sinless* as well as infallible? Her divine side of course is both one and the other; but she has also her human side, her divinity shines through humanity; she is not only the heavenly leaven of Christ's life in the world, but the true and proper life of the world itself also in the *progress of being leavened*. The progress here is not at once the end.

intermediate authority which is felt to be fully valid as a ground of certainty, without regard to the nature of what is thus taken on trust one way or another. "In belief," says Mr. Brownson, "I must go out of myself, and also out of the object, for my motives of assent." Subjective and objective come to no union or contact whatever. The gulph between them is sprung only by means of outward *testimony*. The case requires indeed Divine testimony; but still it is this always as something *between* the subject and object, in a purely separate and external way. As such, the testimony itself needs of course to be authenticated, before it can be rested upon as sure and certain; and this authentication must be again infallible. Such a witness of God's veracity we have in the Church, whose voice accordingly is to be taken as the true sense always of his word. The Divine authority of the Church, it is supposed, may be established for natural reason in its own sphere; although this of itself is not enough to produce faith. For that we need what is termed the *donum fidei*, a supernatural benefit conferred by the ministry of the Church itself through the holy sacrament of Baptism.

We object to the way in which faith is here opposed to reason. Its opposition is properly to sense, and to nature as known through sense; to reason, only so far as this is taken for the understanding in its relation to such knowledge. Faith is the capacity of perceiving the invisible and supernatural, the substantiation of things hoped for, the certification of things not seen (Heb. xi. 1); which, as such, does not hold on the outside of reason, any more than this can be said of sense, but opens to view rather a higher form of what may be called its own proper life, in which it is required to become complete, and without which it must always remain comparatively helpless, blind, and dark. It requires of a truth, in our present circumstances, a supernatural influence to call faith into exercise; no force of logic, and no simply natural motives, can bring it to pass; there must be for the purpose a new life by the Spirit of Christ. But still all this forms at last but the proper education, or drawing out, of the true sense of man's life as it stood before. Faith does not serve simply to furnish new *data* for thought in an outward way, but includes in itself also, potentially at least, the force of reason and knowledge in regard to its own objects. It stands in rational correspondence with its contents, and involves such an apprehension of them as makes the mind to be in some measure actually in their sphere. Faith touches its object as truly as sense. This requires indeed the medium of God's veracity; we can perceive the supernatural, only as we feel and know that

God exists; faith thus sees all things in God. But the veracity of God here is no abstraction; it reaches us in and by the things it verifies and affirms. So in the world of nature. Mr. Brownson will not allow the revelation of God in nature to be for faith at all; we have it, he says, by mere reason; "regarded solely as the author, upholder, and governor of nature, he is natural, and hence the knowledge of him as such is always termed *natural theology*." In this character, "he is naturally cognoscible, according to what St. Paul tells us, Rom. i. 20."—*April*, 1845, p. 146. But surely mere logic can never conclude from the world of sense to the world of spirit, from the finite to the infinite. To perceive God in nature requires far more than any syllogism. We see him there, only when he authenticates himself to us by his works, as the immediate felt symbol of his presence; and then our perception is faith. So St. Paul, Heb. xi. 3: "*Through faith* we understand that the worlds ~~mere~~ framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Through the world of sense, faith looks continually, not the logical understanding, to the vast and glorious Reality that lies beyond, and of which it is only the outward type or shadow. Nature in this view is a divine word, (as in the 19th psalm,) always showing forth the supernatural; having its seal or witness too in the veracity of God, that is, in his being, as a fact underlying the phenomenal creation; while however, at the same time, this fact makes itself immediately certain, not from beyond, but in and by the very document, which it thus seals and certifies for faith. And why should it be different in the case of revelation, under its higher view? God speaks in the Bible; and he must himself authenticate his own voice. This implies however no merely outward certification, apart from the word itself. He reveals himself for faith, in and by the word, as the very medium of his own presence. This becomes most clear in the person of Jesus Christ, the Word Incarnate, by whom all previous revelation is made at last complete. How is *He* authenticated for faith? By Divine testimony. In what form? Miracles, according to Mr. Brownson. "From the miracle the reason concludes legitimately to the supernatural cause, and to the Divine commission or authority of him by whom it is wrought." Jesus Christ performed miracles, and stands accredited by them as a Divine teacher. But could a miracle legitimate the pretensions of the Mormon prophet, Joseph Smith? Certainly not. The miracle itself needs to be authenticated, by the living person and word of him whose commission it is appointed to seal. This is plain from Deut. xiii. 1-3; which is of itself

sufficient to show that reason is concerned, in faith, not simply with the seal of God's word outwardly considered, but with the intrinsic reasonableness also of the word itself. A miracle in favor of a lie proves nothing. Is the word itself then enough, without the miracle? By no means. Only they are not to be sundered one from the other. They are wedded together as body and soul. The body authenticates the presence of the soul; but it is only as the soul, at the same time, authenticates the life of the body. Christ's miracles then are indeed a divine attestation of his character and mission; but their true force for this end holds at last in their relation to his person. *That* underlies all truth in the world besides; and how then could it be proved or made sure by any other form of truth, taken as something separate from itself? Christ thus authenticates himself, and all else that is true. Not abstractly again however, but concretely, in and by the living relations of his presence in the world. The supernatural in his life, including his miracles, forms but the natural and proper expression of what his life was in its own power. The force of all falls back finally on his person itself; and it is with this accordingly that faith has to do primarily, in accepting his Divine mission. The voice of God for it, attesting the revelation comes not from abroad, but in and through the revelation itself. Thou art the Christ, it says with Peter, and to whom else shall we go; thou hast the words of eternal life. "He that believeth on the Son of God," says St. John, "hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God—in and by this revelation—hath made him a liar" (1 John v. 10). Not to own and obey Christ, is the greatest possible wrong to truth which any man can commit. It is such a blow at God's veracity as can be aimed at it in no other way; for the Truth of truth itself is Christ, the alpha and omega of life, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Faith here is not indifferent to the word and work of Christ; but still it sees these in the light of his person, and does not so much conclude to this as from it, in the view it takes of their significance. It is not by establishing his miraculous conception, or the fact of his resurrection, in an abstract separate view, that we prove him to be the Son of God; but we must feel him in the first place to be the Son of God, with Peter, before we can truly believe, on any evidence, either the first of these facts or the last. *He* is the last proof of both. So in the Creed. Christ authenticates himself for faith, not by mere outward warrant and seal of any sort, but by direct communication, in some way, with the rational nature of men, as being himself indeed the life of reason and the only true light

of the world. Faith here, as in all other cases, is led by motives of assent in its object, and not simply by motives drawn from some other quarter; or in other words, the authority of God moving it is not on the outside of the object, but comes to view in and by the object bearing its proper seals, these last having no conclusive force save in union and connection with the first.

Mr. Brownson himself is forced to allow something like this in the end, though as it seems to us not without contradiction to his own general theory. Reason may conclude in its own sphere, he says, from the natural to the supernatural by the miracle; but not so as to generate faith; this comes in another way as a free donation from God. It is not given to us in the fact that we are human beings, but supernaturally, so as to lift us from the order of nature to the order of grace. Supernaturalized in this way, "the creditive subject is placed on the plane of the supernatural credible object, and they are thus *correlatively* creditive and credible; and if no obstacle intervene, the act of faith is not only elicitable, but elicited, *without other motive than is contained in the subject and object*, as is the case with every act of faith, whether human or divine." Faith then is not blind and regardless of its object. "The *donum fidei* is not a general *vis credativa*, but simply *vis credativa* in relation to its special correlative, the supernatural credible object." What it believes is the authority of God, but this authority in identification always with the object it commends to faith; just as light, in the natural world, bears witness to the objects of sense, shows them as they are for the eye, by making them at the same time the medium of its own revelation. Such is the view given of the subject in the article, *Liberalism and Catholicity*.—*July, 1846*; which however, as we have just said, seems not to agree fully with what is said, when we are told, *April, 1845*, "that faith or belief, as distinguished from knowledge and science, rests on authority extrinsic both to the believer and the matter believed." If this be meant simply to exclude the notion that reason is the mother of faith, the so-called *Vulgar Rationalism*, it is all very well. But in the hands of Mr. Brownson, it is made to mean much more. It sets faith out of the sphere of reason altogether, and reduces it to the character of a mere blind assent to outward authority; contrary to what we find him saying again of the *donum fidei*, as an actual bringing of the subject into inward correlation with the object believed. Where the authority for faith is thus taken to be extrinsic to the supernatural object, as with the system generally, we are thrown at last on the very rationalism, which it is sought in this way to avoid. So our

common abstract supernaturalism, on the Protestant side, is in the habit of concluding *logically*, from miracles and other evidence in the sphere of nature, to the supernatural authority of the Bible, and then pretends to make this, in such outward view, a complete succedaneum subsequently for all reason besides—as though reason and revelation were only contiguous spheres, the one ending where the other begins; not considering, that the whole authority of the Bible itself thus can be no better at last than the strength of the logic, on which as an arch it is made in this way fundamentally to rest. To make the Church however a succedaneum for reason, in like outward style, comes precisely to the same thing. Allow the *donum fidei*, as an elevation of the mind to the plane of the supernatural, and the case is changed; but then also it is no longer easy to see, why faith should be bound so mechanically to the voice of the Church, as an authority extrinsical to the truth itself. The Church we hold too to be the medium of the Christian revelation, the organ by which Christ makes himself known in the world, and which is to be reverenced on this account, through all ages, as his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. But it is all this, not in a mechanical quasi-magical way, as a witness set forward to propound the truth in outward style only, a supernatural automaton with the Pope at Rome for its mouth piece. The Church is the body of Christ, only as it serves to reveal Christ, under a truly living and historical form, in the history of the world; in which view all the power it has to propound Christ as an object of faith, is found in the fact of its being itself an object of faith through Christ and from him, the form in which his life completes itself among men. Faith starts then in Christ. *Because* we believe in him, we believe also the Holy Catholic Church; and not in the reverse order. The Church is still necessary as an indefectible witness to the truth; but her indefectibility is a moral fact, not a physical necessity, made good through the activity of the general Christian life itself, the life of Christ in his people, working out its own problem in a truly human way. Why should not the supernatural in this form be quite as accessible for the *donum fidei*, as when exhibited or propounded in a purely outward and abstract style? Nature, we know, is not grace. This pertains to a higher order. But why may not the higher order reveal itself through the very life and constitution of the lower, supernaturalizing it for its own ends, as well as in an abrupt outside way; in such sort as to be for faith still all the authority that is needed, to place it in the infallible possession of Christ's word?

It may be made a question, whether the Roman system itself, rightly understood, actually claims in its own favor any such purely outward and mechanical infallibility, as we find attributed to it by Mr. Brownson and others of like wholesale zeal. At least, there is much in its order and history to conflict with the supposition, and to show that it is not the true original sense of what the Church is required to be for our faith in this view. A somewhat curious exemplification is furnished here by a late work entitled, *Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome*; in which, among other discussions, there occurs a friendly disputation with two learned professors of the Roman University on this very topic, the infallibility of the Church. The ground is taken on the Protestant side, that the Church of Rome does not formally claim to be infallible, that there is no decree of any general council, no bull of any pope, no canon or article of an authoritative nature, asserting any such attribute in her favor. This was at first treated with derision by the Jesuit professors; but on being seriously challenged to prefer proof to the contrary, they showed themselves completely puzzled and perplexed, and in the end were compelled fairly to give up the point. With all their learning, no such decree, bull, or canon, could be quoted.¹ It is one thing to affirm that the Church is indefectible, as the

¹ *Mornings among the Jesuits at Rome. Being Notes of conversations held with certain Jesuits on the Subject of Religion in the City of Rome. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M. A.—p. 138-144.* The work has some things that read strangely. So far as we know, however, it is allowed to pass as authentic. Since the date of these conversations, we have a pretty explicit claim to infallibility, in the form required, on the part of the present Pope, if his Encyclical Epistle, Nov. 9, 1846, is to be taken as of any canonical force. "Hinc plane appetet," he says, "in quanto errore illi etiam versentur, qui ratione abutentes, ac Dei eloquia tamquam humanum opus existimantes, proprio arbitrio illa explicare, interpretari temere audent, cum Deus ipse jam constituerit auctoritatem, que verum legitimumque caelstis sua revelationis sensum doceret, constabiliret, omnesque controversias in rebus fidei et morum infallibili judicio dirimeret, ne fideles circumferantur omni vento doctrinæ in nequitia hominum ad circumventionem erroris. Quæ quidem viva et infallibilis auctoritas in ea tantum viget Ecclesia, quæ a Christo Domino supra Petrum ædificata, suos legitimos semper habet Pontifices sine intermissione ab ipso Petro ducentes originem, in ejus Cathedra collatatos, et ejusdem etiam doctrinæ, dignitatis, honoris ac potestatis hæredes et vindices. Et quoniam ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia, ac Petrus per Romanum Pontificem loquitur, et semper, in suis successoribus vivit, et judicium exercet, ac præstat quærentibus fidei veritatem, iecirco divina eloquia eo plane sensu sunt accipienda, quem tenuit ac tenet hæc Romana Beatissimi Petri Cathedra, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum mater et magistra fidem a Christo Domino traditam integrum inviolatamque semper servavit."—This is sufficiently bold and strong, it must be confessed.

pillar and ground of the truth, and another thing quite to predicate infallibility of all her judgments and decisions in an abstract magical way. The Church is constitutionally holy, called to holiness and formed for holiness; yet never in such form as to be absolutely free, here on earth, from corruption and sin. So too she is constitutionally true, and the truth can never fail from her communion, as it can have no place also beyond it; yet all this in the midst of present error, confusion and contradiction. The truth is in her life, considered as a whole, and is to be sought in such form by the individual believer, with child-like though still free and independent docility and obedience. Even the Church of Rome is compelled to allow this to some extent, in her own way. If the case required only an outward oracle on the one side, and implicit passive obedience on the other, how has it happened that the authority after all is not offered, in every case, in the most direct and universally accessible form, for all to read or hear at any moment without the possibility of mistake? This, we all know, is not the case. The infallibility attaches, not to the ministers of the Church separately, but to the ministry as a whole; and so it is only in certain circumstances, and under certain conditions, that the Pope himself, the head of the corporation, is to be taken as its true voice. Seven requisites must be at hand, we are told, to show a decision of the pope infallible; 1st. communication with the bishops of the universal Church, asking the assistance of their prayers; 2nd. the possession of all available information on the point in hand; 3d. a formal assertion of authority; 4th. universal promulgation; 5th. universal reception by the Church as infallible authority; 6th. limitation to proper sphere, having for its matter a question of faith or morals; 7th. freedom, on the part of the pope, from all outward compulsion or constraint. This is something wide away from a mere mechanical infallibility. There is no safety in the mind of the pope, any farther than it is found to hold in *living communion* with the mind of the universal Church; and of this no assurance can be had by the common christian, without active, waking, and earnest attention on his own part. Plainly the infallibility here claimed is not inspiration. Mr. Brownson himself makes it to be different. If however it were wholly above the ordinary law of knowledge, by which truth is apprehended through the activity of mind in its general living character, it must be fully equivalent to inspiration or else mere magic. The very fact then that this is disclaimed, goes to show that the infallibility in question is conditioned after all by the working of the universal mind of the Church, that it is a result

of the concrete life of the Church, and that it belongs thus to the process of history and must bear also a truly historical form. If it were not so, why should the pope ever hesitate or pause, when any new decision is to be made, instead of fetching forth at once from the promptuary of his infallible stewardship the precise answer required. Just now, it seems, he is travailing in pain with the article of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and has called on the bishops of the universal Church to assist him by their prayers, in the business of bringing it, if possible, to a satisfactory official decision.¹ But if there be no *history* for christian doctrine, no development, no growth or progress; if on the contrary all is to be regarded as a full grown Minerva from the beginning; why, we may well ask, the suspense of centuries on this great article heretofore, in the midst of interminable strife and war; and why this difficulty in bringing the infallibility of the pope to bear upon it forthwith, for its final settlement at the present time. It shows two things; first, that Christianity, for Rome itself, is *not* full grown from the start, and one always in the form of its faith; secondly, that the pope, to have authority even for Rome, must be more than a divine automaton, must be incorporated actively with the life of the Church, must be the organ of truth for it through the mediation

¹ See his late Encyclical, dated Gaeta, Feb. 2, 1849; where he represents the subject as weighing heavily on his mind, announces that he has appointed a special commission of eminent theologians and cardinals to investigate its claims, and calls upon the bishops to have prayers solemnly offered in all the churches for his illumination and guidance in so great a concern, as well as to report to him the mind and feeling of the faithful in regard to it throughout the Catholic world. This surely is something more than simply affirming an old truth, clearly possessed from the beginning, in the face of a new error. "If there be anything in which Catholic theologians are agreed," says Mr. Brownson, "it is in these two points; that the revelation in the beginning was perfect, and that nothing can be proposed by the Church to be believed, *fide divina*, not revealed from the beginning."—1847, p. 66. "If there be anything uniformly taught by our theologians, it is that the faith of the Fathers was perfect, that the revelation committed to the Church was complete and entire, and that the Church has, from the first, faithfully, infallibly, taught or proposed it. If this be true, as it would at least be temerity to question, there can be, there can have been, no latent or merely virtual doctrine, waiting for heresy and controversy to call it forth, and to render it formal and actual. There is implicit belief,—for individuals may be ignorant, some on one point, and some on another; but there is, save in a very restricted sense indeed, no implicit teaching."—p. 77. Has the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin been part of this formal teaching from the time of the Apostles? If so, why all this hesitation and care on the part of the Pope, about erecting it into an article of faith in the year 1849?

of this life itself, reaching him at last in a perfectly human and historical way. With any such view as this, however, the theory of infallibility against which we have been arguing, and which seems to us to be held by Mr. Brownson, at once falls to the ground.

We have a striking, and as it appears to us very significant, illustration of Mr. Brownson's wrong view of history, in an article on *The Church in the Dark Ages*, published *July*, 1849. While he shows off with just severity the stupidity of the slang, which is often employed against this period, by men who show themselves profoundly ignorant of the whole glorious mission accomplished by the Church after the downfal of the Roman empire,¹ he has no mind at the same time to fall in with the undue glorification of mediæval history into which some have been carried latterly, by a sort of reaction against that other extreme. Digby's *Mores Catholici, or Ages of Faith*, he considers not sufficiently guarded on this side. With all that was good in the Chnrch, as such, those ages were full of abominations under a different view. She had by no means a clear field and her own way, for a thousand years, as her enemies now say, but stood in constant battle with hostile forces that sought to bring her down to the dust. It is well enough, Mr. Brownson thinks, for Protestants, of the Romantic and Puseyite Schools, to seek a rehabilitation of this old, long misunderstood and abused, mediæval life; their own Chureh is a mere corpse, and they may be pardoned for seeking to deck her off in the robes of the dead past, instead of those that belong to the present; but with Catholics (Roman) it is different. "They seek their Lord not

¹ "Never indeed did she give more unequivocal proofs of her supernatural origin and support, than in those ages of ignorance, violence and blood; never did she struggle with more manifest supernatural constancy and force, or with more glorious trophies to her celestial prowess." Those ages open with the destruction of the Western Roman Empire, and the permanent settlement of the Northern Barbarians on its ruins. Society was reduced almost to chaos, a new civilization was to be created out of the most wild and rude material. The church, after having subdued the world as it stood before had her own work to do over again. "Far more disheartening were her prospects than when she concealed herself, in the catacombs, or bled under Nero, Decius, Maximian, and Diocletian; and far more laborious was the task now before her, than that which she had accomplished in passing from that upper room in Jerusalem to the throne of the Cæsars." Alas, how much of the argument for the divine power of christianity as found in the form of church history, is obscured or altogether lost for those who yield themselves to the prejudice, (blind as Erebus, though wiser in its own conceit than seven men who can render a reason,) that the darkness of the Middle Ages sprang from the Catholic Church.

in the dead past, but in the living present, in the Church that is, and is to be until the consummation of the world, unvaried and invariable." The distinctive human side of the Middle Ages, the new element which then came into society, Mr. Brownson seems anxious rather to disown, as something outward and foreign altogether to the proper Christian life. As far as the Church was active in the phenomena of the time, we accept them and glory in them, he tells us, but as it regards all lying beyond, we feel comparatively indifferent. "Under the point of view of humanity, it matters little to us, as Catholics, how dark, how superstitious, how turbulent, violent, or barbarous" these ages were. Strange to say, we find the advocate of Romanism here joining hands, to some extent, with Pseudo-protestantism, in the view that the proper sense of the world was interrupted and stopped by the overthrow of the old Roman civilization; that there is no meaning in the chaos that follows, farther than it gave room to labor for the recovery of what had been lost; and that the great task and problem for a whole millennium of years following, was simply to fill up its own blank by the reconstruction of the Christian life once more in its first form. How does this happen? Pseudo-protestantism sees in the Middle Ages only the growing power of Rome, and gives them up accordingly as a "grand apostacy" from first to last, (the Devil's millenium, Christ asleep and the gates of hell triumphant,) for the purpose of making short and easy its own argument against the Pope. Mr. Brownson, on the other side, with much better perspicacity, begins to see in these same Middle Ages, Dark Ages, or as they are sometimes called Ages of Faith, the embryonic life of Protestantism itself, ripening in the womb of Catholicism, by a pregnancy of centuries instead of months, under the forms of the Roman faith and worship, for the mighty birth that followed by due course of time in the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Such undoubtedly is the true view of this great fact. Protestants, who insist on sundering the Reformation from the Church life of the previous period, do as much as they well can to ruin their own cause. Unless it be the product of all earlier church history, it can deserve no faith. Let it appear on the other hand, that the causes which led to it, under God, were in full force for centuries before; that they were seated in the life of the modern world as a part of its intrinsic nature and constitution; that their operation is to be traced back even to the world-historical epoch, which laid the foundations of modern society amid the crumbling ruins of that which went before; and it becomes at once to the same extent

difficult to resist the conviction, that it belongs to the true sense of Christianity, and that it came to pass by the finger of God. Such in truth is the actual state of the case. The new form of humanity brought in by the Northern Barbarians did not merely furnish material for re-civilizing Europe in its old form, but offered elements which were not previously at hand for the creation also of another order of civilization; by which in the end Christianity was to become more complete, than it could ever have become under the first order. Out of this new order of the Christian life, made possible only through the Germanic nature as distinguished from the old Roman, sprang with inward necessity at last the *Protest* of the Reformation. Mr. Brownson, as we have said, sees this; more quick of vision here than many Protestants; and sets himself to forestall, as he best can, the weight it carries against his own cause. "We frankly confess," he says, "we are Graeco-Roman, and to us all tribes and nations are barbarian, just in proportion as they recede from the Graeco Roman standard." This is the climax of culture, humanly considered. "Nowhere else does history show us man receiving, under all the aspects of his nature, so high, so thorough, so symmetrical, and so masculine a cultivation, as under this wonderful civilization." Add Christianity to it, "and you have a civilization beyond which there is nothing to seek." Tried by this standard, the Middle Ages cannot stand the test. The Church labored to re-civilize them, as well as she could, according to the old ~~norm~~, with which she has a native affinity; but this could be done only so far as the nations were brought to exchange the Barbaric nature for the Roman. "Wherever the barbaric element has remained predominant in the national life, as in Russia, Scandinavia, Prussia, Saxony, Northern Germany, or where, through exterior or interior causes, it has regained the preponderance, as in England and the once Christianized Oriental nations, the nation has relapsed into heathenism, or fallen off into heresy or schism. In several of the nations which have fallen off from the Church, the old barbaric institutions, traditions, customs, and hereditary hatred of Graeco-Roman civilization, always survived in the heart of the people, and nourished a schism between its national life and its Christian faith." In all this there is much truth. The Romanic nations remain Papal; while the Germanic nations, in virtue of a new element peculiar to themselves, could never make over their will in the same way to mere outward rule, and so in the end have become Protestant. It is perfectly clear that *nationality* has exercised a determining influence on this great issue, from the beginning.

Protestantism is the child of the modern civilization, the Teutonic life, and not of the Græco-Roman.¹

But what now is the true significance of this fact? The old Græco Roman civilization, says Mr. Brownson, must be held normal for all ages; your Teutonic life consequently is at fault, just in the measure of its variation from this rule; and so Protestantism is found to be simply part and parcel of the same general abnormality, the final upshot, we may say, of the war carried on with the authority of the church by the refractory spirit of these Northern Barbarians from the beginning. A convenient theory truly. But how violent, at the same time, and arbitrary. Only see what it involves. The normal order of the world naturally considered, its best possible form and true ultimate sense, just as it was ready to go fully into the arms of Christianity, suddenly dashed to the ground and turned into universal wreck by the inundation of an entirely new life, uncivilized, unlettered, absolutely wild and rude: Europe planted with elementary nations, requiring the growth of centuries to bring them to any mature and settled political form: The work of a thousand years laid upon the church, only to regain in some measure the loss created by this sad catastrophe: A new civilization in time, which refuses however to fall fully into the true Christian order; carries in it more or less a semi-barbarous, heathenish character; and issues finally in an open rebellion against the

¹ American life might seem to be, in this view, the very efflorescence of the Protestant spirit, and as such the worst possible for the admission of Catholic influences. Mr. Brownson, however, judges differently. "Our civilization," he tells us, "is founded on a right basis, is Roman and Christian in its ground work; and there never has been a State constituted throughout more in harmony with Catholic principles than the American." True, our American fathers had unhappily turned their backs upon the Church; but they had been nursed, notwithstanding, in the bosom of her civilization. "That civilization they brought with them to this New World, purged of the barbaric leaven which was still in some measure retained in the Mother country, and against which the Popes and the whole spiritual society had protested for ten centuries. Whoever will examine the respective civil institutions of England and this country, will hardly fail to perceive, that what of England we have rejected is what she owes to her barbarous ancestors, and what we have added, which she has not, has been borrowed from Roman and Catholic civilization. Indeed, just in proportion, under a civil and political point of view, as we have receded from England, we have approached Rome and Catholicity."—*Civil and Religious Toleration*.—July, 1849, p. 307. Here is a discovery worth looking at certainly. The precious spark of liberty, to which we owe our Constitution, is after all not from Geneva but from Rome! The Pilgrim Fathers stand in the same line, politically, with the Popes! Puritanism belongs of right to Popery. The body is here already prepared; "it is moulded from fine, rich, red earth, in a form of majestic proportions, and of surpassing beauty, wanting nothing but the Divine Breath to be breathed into its nostrils in order to become a living soul."

Church, which at the same time bears away with it palpably the central powers and activities of the world's natural life, with a momentum which centuries have no power to check or restrain. It needs surely no small gift of faith seriously and steadily to give credit to all this. Was the wreck of Graeco Roman culture an *accident*? Did the Northern Barbarians come on the stage of Europe, without God's will and plan? Was there no end to be answered for Christianity and the world, by the taking down of the former civilization, the bringing in of new material, the open field created for the building up of another life, and the work of so many centuries employed in the accomplishment of this great object? These questions, it seems to us, carry in them their own answers. The true use to be made of the whole case, then is just the reverse of Mr. Brownson's view. God moves in history. It must therefore have meaning. It must especially minister to Christ and his Church; for is not *he* head over the whole of it, for this very end? If a sparrow fall not without his eye, how could the *Völkerwanderung* take place by chance? The fact that he should so remove the old, and make room for the new, and call in the historical process of a thousand years to come to his object, is itself enough to show, not only that the new civilization thus sought was to be different from that which was rejected in its favor, but also that it was to be of a superior order, of more vigorous constitution, better suited to the wants of humanity and more answerable to the interior demands of Christianity. This superiority of the modern civilization, then, turns on the new element which has been brought into it by the Germanic or Barbarian life, in distinction from the old Roman. It amounts to nothing that Mr. Brownson stigmatizes this as heathen; for the old Roman life was originally heathen too; and it is purely gratuitous to assume that Christianity might not appropriate and assimilate to itself the peculiarities of a Barbarian nationality as fully and completely as those of the Graeco-Roman. Its province is not to stand on the outside of nature in the way of foreign help, but to enter into it, to clarify it, and to fill it with divinity after its own form and type. The new civilization thus brought to pass carried in itself, from the beginning, the principle of *freedom*, which gave birth finally, as Christ had all along designed, to the fact of Protestantism. Its distinctive power, of course, fell in with this fact. The Romanic nations were left behind; not without some great ulterior purpose, we presume; while the Germanic nations, obedient to the law of their life, are carrying the sense of history in the Protestant direction. It does not follow at once, we know, that Protestantism is all that the world needs for its salvation, because it now carries all temporal interests in its stream. Outward activity and

strength are not of themselves the guaranty of grace. The Protestant movement *may* prove morally unequal to its own problem. Still this cannot change the significance of the fact as now stated. It belongs to the reigning power of the world's civilization. It has its seat in the spirit of the nations that go with it, and their spirit now rules the course of humanity, as something plainly in advance of the spirit that meets us in nations still bound to the authority of Rome. In this view, if we believe in Christ, we are bound to acknowledge in it, if nothing more, yet surely the necessary medium of transition at least for the Church of God into a higher and better state. Not to do so, turns the past into a riddle and shrouds the future in despair. Protestantism, as the world now stands at all events, has the floor of history, carries the word of the age; and the last sense of Christianity, the grand scope of Christ's Mediatorial reign, is to be reached *through* it, by its help and intervention in some way, and not by its being hurled aside as an impertinent accident, or mere nullity, in the course of this all conquering dispensation.

It is high time for us, however, to bring this long article to a conclusion. It will be perceived that our object has been, to convict the general Roman principle of falsehood, by showing it to run into untenable consequences and to be at war with the true conception of our life. This is not with us, of course, an argument for the mere negation or denial of the same principle, as the true meaning and force of Protestantism. We have before tried to expose the rock on that side; and our object now in setting forth the dangers of the whirlpool, is not certainly to recommend the first, as on the whole less false and terrible than the second. Rationalism, the resolution of faith into the mere mind and will of man, (with the Bible or without it,) under all its forms and shapes, we religiously abhor and hate. With the reigning slang on that side, we have no sympathy whatever. Here then the question comes, How are these extremes to be at once both avoided? And no question can well be more great and solemn. We pretend not now, however, to answer it. Enough so far, if we have been able to show that it needs and demands an answer; that the truth is not, in this case, in either of the alternatives, separately taken, which for the common understanding seem to cover the whole ground; that Christianity, in one word, must find its true sense between them, in a form of life which shall be the union of both. It is much to be sure of what is false and wrong here, even if at a loss still to master the full meaning of what is right. The best preparation for solving the problem of the age, is to be well satisfied that the problem really exists, and so to feel earnestly that it calls for a solution.

J. W. N.

THE OLD PALATINATE LITURGY OF 1563.

As the subject of congregational worship is awakening new interest in our Church, it must be desirable for us to become more familiar with our Liturgical history than we have hitherto been. By some, indeed, vastly higher importance may be attached to results reached by an abstract consideration of the merits of the question itself, than to any suggestions of past history. Still it must, on many accounts, be interesting to know definitely, what views our Reformed Fathers held upon the subject. We may, perhaps, not be willing to build our creed exactly on their coffins, nor to pin our faith to their shrouds. And yet we may believe that they were about as *wise* as their children are *to know* the right, and as *piously* disposed *to choose* it when known! In paying deference, therefore, to their opinions and practices, it is not so much them that we honor, as the truth and grace by which, with one accord, we believe them to have been guided. Mistrusting ourselves, and fearful lest self-complacency or a deceived heart might lead us to mistake the twinkling rays of our reason or fancy for celestial light, we would test the supposed agreement of our views with the divine Word, by comparing them with the opinions of others equally capable of interpreting its voice, and quite as willing as we to make it the man of their counsel. And assuredly there is wisdom in being as jealous of the influence of erring individual judgment, as of the authority of such tradition.

The most satisfactory method, undoubtedly, of ascertaining the earlier views of our Church upon the Liturgical question, is to consult its known usage, and see what it actually did. If we should turn to our Reformed Fathers for counsel upon the solemn subject, so earnestly discussed at the late Synod in Norristown, they could certainly in no way gratify us so completely, (though we should thereby be involved in merited reproach for our forgetfulness of their pious labors and legacy,) as by handing us the Liturgy which they themselves had framed. Had it been permitted to good old Ursinus, or Olevianus, or Frederick III. of "Christlieb'seligen Gedächtniß," to sit with that ecclesiastical assembly, and in solemn form mingle with its discussions, and announce their views, with what intense interest and profound respect would not their words have been heard

and received. The spectre tradition would have vanished before such spirits, like Banquo's ghost before the peeping day. But imposing and impressive as such a scene would have been, the effect it would have produced can be more intelligently and satisfactorily reached in another way. Though we may not conjure up their beatified spirits from the happy abode of the pious dead, we may summon the book containing their sentiments in the most substantial form, forth from the dust, which through long years of neglect has been permitted to bury it. And if we succeed in this, we can scarcely start an inquiry touching our earlier Liturgical history, which may not find a candid answer. If we ask what did our Fathers think of written or printed prayers for public use, the book will tell us. If we ask what were their practical views of the holy sacraments, the book will tell us. If we ask what they thought of public confession, sacerdotal absolution, Church festival days, and saints' days, again the book will answer. And thus might we proceed, until almost every important question that could be put, were satisfactorily solved.

This privilege now may be enjoyed. The desired book is at hand. It comes to us with the following comprehensive title-page : “ *The Palatinate Liturgy, directing how the Christian doctrine, the holy sacraments and ceremonies, are to be administered in all the Churches of the Palatinate : as the same was originally published ; now revised and reprinted after the edition of 1684.* ” And with the hope that I may thereby do an acceptable service to many Brethren, I will attempt a translation of at least so much of this excellent old Liturgy, as seems of most importance, and as may afford those interested a fair opportunity of judging its merits as a whole. The copy before us is that now in the possession of the Rev. Father Pomp, of the history and general contents of which notice is taken by Dr. Nevin in his valuable tract upon the Heidelberg Catechism.¹

The book is introduced and authorized by the following imprimatur :—

¹ There is one deficiency about this edition of the Liturgy, which is to be regretted, viz : it leaves us without a single hint either of the place where, or the authority by which it was published. At the bottom of the title-page we find the words—“ *Für die Kirche zu*”—followed by a blank, which in the case of the copy before me, is filled up with “ *America*. ”

" We, Charles, by the grace of God Count of the Palatinate, on the Rhine, chief Treasurer and Elector of the Imperial kingdom, Prince of Bavaria, &c., *present* to all and each of the general Inspectors, Clergymen, and others employed in the churches and schools of our Electorate and Principality, *our greeting*, above all grace, and every good, and direct you herewith to know :

That whereas—The Right Honorable Prince, our kind and beloved relative, Frederick III Elector Palatine, of blessed ancestral christian memory, did, in the year 1563, order the preparation and publication of a Liturgy, together with a summary of christian instruction, faithfully drawn from the pure word of God,—which was afterwards, anno, 85, republished by our kind and worthy uncle, Count Palatine John Casimir, and was thus used in our Electorate and Principality until 1601, when again our worthy predecessor, Count Palatine Frederick IV, at the instance of His Counsellors, and principal Theologians, after that it was improved in a few places, and explained, ordered it to be republished, of which however now, upon our assuming the Government, but very few copies can be had, and therefore pressing necessity requires that it should be printed anew, we therefore have resolved to order the same to be herewith done :

We therefore enjoin it upon all our subjects and people, by virtue hereof, that ye aid and promote, to the best of your ability, this necessary and christian undertaking. Especially are the above-named Inspectors, Clergymen, and others employed in the service of the churches and schools, commanded to use this our Formulary in the preaching of the word of God, the Administration of the Holy Sacraments, and such other services as belong to their office, in all the churches and schools belonging to our Electorate, that they may with becoming propriety, faithfully and decently discharge their office. Thus will the spread of God's saving word be promoted, and the edification of His Holy Church; and thus will our confident desire and intention be complied with."

Dated—*Heidleberg, Jan. 29, anno 1684.*

Next to this interesting, old-fashioned introduction we have—

" A Register, or page in which each title may be found.

I. *Of Doctrine.*

1—Regulation for sermons, whence they are to be derived, and to what end they are to be directed.

2—A general introduction to sermons, and exhortation, to prayer.

3—Sermons for the Sabbath day, when and how they are to be held.

4, 5, and 6—Sermons on Week, Fast, Festival, and Holy-days.

7—Morning and Evening lesson of a Chapter, and a brief exposition thereof.

8—Preparatory-sermon.

9 and 10—Catechisation and the Catechism.

11—A summary of the Catechism, together with the texts of the principal parts of the christian religion.

12—Several passages of the Holy Scriptures, in which every one may see, in any station, age and condition, what his calling requires him to do.

II. *Of Public Prayer.*

1—A prayer before the sermon.

2—A prayer for the Sabbath, after the morning sermon.

3—A prayer after the sermon on the Catechism.

4 and 13—Prayers for, a fast-day, Christmas, Newyears-day, Good-friday, Easter, Ascension, Whitsuntide, and a morning and evening prayer.

III. *Of the Administration of the Holy Sacraments.*

1—An admonition concerning Holy Baptism.

2—Formula of Baptism.

3—Preparation for the Lord's Supper.

4—Formula for the administration of the Lord's Supper.

5—Of the power of the keys, and christian discipline.

IV. *Of other Church Customs and Services.*

1—Of festival and Holy-days.

2—Of Church-psalmody and robes.

3—Formula for the annunciation and administration of Marriage.

4—Of the visitation of the sick.

5 and 6—A prayer for the sick, and dying.

7—Of administering the Lord's supper to the sick.

8—Of the visitation of Prisoners.

- 9—Burial-service.
- 10—Formula for the baptism of Ana-baptists.
- 11—“ “ “ of Jews.
- 12—Formula for administering the Lord's supper to the sick.
- 13—Formula for the admission of children to the Holy Sacrament.”

A most promising and significant table of contents, this, and of itself rich in important historical hints and practical suggestions. How full of meaning especially the first item noted, touching the source and aim of sermons! Let us then, turning again to the Book, see what all is intended by this regulation.

“ Of Doctrine.”

Regulation Concerning Sermons &c.

Sermons are to } Thus saith the Lord Jesus Christ, John xvii.
be derived from } chap., v.: 3, “This is life eternal, that they
the word of God. } may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus
Christ, whom Thou hast sent.” In order that He might lead His
chosen ones, to the knowledge of this eternal life, the Lord Jesus
appointed the preaching of repentance, and the forgiveness of sins,
that by this means (thus instituted on account of our infirmity,
which would not be able to bear the voice of God Himself) the
knowledge of God, and eternal life might be begun in our hearts
here on earth, until we attain in Heaven without external means to
that perfection in which we shall behold God face to face.

And whereas God hath revealed Himself in His Word, which is
fully contained in Canonicis Libris, that is the genuine undoubted
Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; therefore all sermons
are to be drawn therefrom, and based thereon, and always directed
to the existing wants and sins of the people, according to the declar-
ation of the Holy Apostle Paul, ii. Tim. iii., xvi, “All scripture
given of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction,
for instruction in righteousness, that a man of God may be perfect,
thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”¹

Sermons are to } And inasmuch as the Word of God directs
be adapted to the } its doctrine to this end, that men may be led
Catechism } to a knowledge of their sins and misery; then
instructs them how they may be delivered from all their sins and
misery; and thereby, how they shall thank God for such deliver-
ance: therefore Preachers, in treating their texts, shall diligently

¹ This is the German version of the passage.

consider these three points, and be careful to use the medicine according to the necessity of wounded consciences. They shall also study to suit their sermons to the weak capacities of the common people, so that the article of the Catechism, to which the subject of their sermon has reference, may be intelligibly introduced and impressed upon their minds.

Ministers of the gospel shall further not presume to expound any other book besides the Holy Scriptures, without the advice and previous knowledge of their Inspectors, who shall then take care that such books are set forth and expounded, as may be most edifying to the unlearned.

General Introduction of all Sermons.

Grace, peace, and mercy, from God the Father, and His beloved Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all, Amen—

OR :

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all, Amen.—ii. Cor. xiii. 13.

Exhortation to prayer, to be used occasionally by the Minister before the sermon, especially on Week-days.

Beloved in the Lord Jesus Christ, let us call upon our faithful God and Father, and humbly beseech Him, to turn away His face from our sins, by which we have constantly kindled His wrath against us. And whereas we are, alas! altogether unworthy to appear before His Holy Majesty, let us entreat Him to look upon us in the face of His beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord, accept of the merits of His suffering and death in satisfaction for all our sins, and thus render us acceptable unto Him. Let us also supplicate Him that He would by His Holy Spirit, enlighten us with the right understanding of His Word, and grant us grace to receive the same with true faith and humility, that we may learn therefrom to withdraw all our confidence, continually more and more, from all creatures, and trust in Him alone, to serve and glorify Him, that our whole life may praise His name, and we may render Him that love and obedience, which faithful servants owe unto their Lord, and children unto their Father, seeing that it hath pleased Him to call us and accept of us, to be His servants, and children, and heirs of future glory. Let us therefore beseech Him for these things, as our faithful Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ hath taught us to pray, sincerely saying:

Our Father who art in Heaven, &c.

Regulation for preaching on Sabbath-days.

On every Sabbath morning at eight o'clock, a sermon shall be preached from the word of God, in all cities, towns and villages, which, as indeed all other sermons, shall not exceed an hour in length.

The sermon shall be introduced by one of the forms prescribed above, and may be followed by the prayer hereafter designated, commencing: "Our Heavenly Father, &c."

The morning service shall be concluded with the public confession of sin, and absolution, in connection with the appended prayer. After the prayer a short Psalm may be sung, and the congregation dismissed to their homes with the benediction: "The Lord bless Thee &c."

A catechetical sermon shall also be preached, every Sabbath afternoon, at such an hour as may be most convenient for each congregation. And wherever two sermons are delivered in an afternoon, as in cities and larger towns, at the first, after singing, God shall be called upon in prayer for grace rightly to understand His Word. Next to this at the commencement of the sermon, the summary of the Catechism,¹ together with the texts of the five chief points, shall be distinctly read to the people, when a half hour shall be employed in explaining a few questions of the summary. After the sermon on these questions, the youth shall be examined, and finally the whole service be concluded with prayer and singing, and the people permitted to return home.

In the other service, to be held towards evening, the principal points of Christian doctrine, contained in the Catechism, shall be explained somewhat more fully and in detail, for the benefit of the aged and adults. The introduction shall be the same as in the case of other sermons—viz: the prescribed greeting, singing and prayer. Afterwards a text corresponding with the doctrine under consideration, together with the appropriate questions of the Catechism, shall be read, and clearly expounded. The whole shall be concluded with the prayer given below, and directed to be used after catechisation.

In the country however, where only one service is held in the afternoon, the youth shall assemble at the second ringing of the bell, to be *examined* and *catechised*; when this is finished, the bell shall be rung the third time, that the whole congregation may gather together. Then as an introduction, after singing and prayer, the summary of the Catechism together with the texts shall be read. Afterwards a half hour may be spent in explaining several ques-

¹ This is placed immediately after the complete Catechism, and consists of twenty-three questions and answers, forming the marrow of the Heidelberg Catechism.

tions, when those who are prepared to answer with meekness and modesty, may be examined and instructed in the fundamental truths of salvation, and the service be concluded with the usual prayer.

Sermons during the Week.

Two sermons shall be preached in every city (or large town) during the week, on working-days, namely on Wednesday and Friday; and in villages one sermon, on Wednesday or some other more suitable day, when German psalms or hymns shall be sung both before and after the sermon. The service shall be concluded with the particular prayers designated below under the proper title.

Fast-day Sermons.

And inasmuch as the righteous anger of God is kindled more and more every day, in these last evil times, by horrible vices and crimes, by blasphemies contempt of His word, gluttony, drunkenness, lewdness, fornication, and the like fearful iniquities, which are becoming so prevalent that we must greatly fear, yea feel undoubtedly certain, that the terrible chastisements, threatening us on every side, will break in upon us with power, if we take not warning, and implore the Lord for mercy :

It becomes highly necessary for us to turn unto God our Lord, in hearty sorrow and repentance, with humble and believing supplication entreating Him to hold back the uplifted rod.

The first Wednesday of each month } A special day of prayer shall therefore be observed on the first Wednesday of every month, on which all, both young and old, men and women, and servants, shall as far as possible, meet together, according to the special Proclamation issued, in order heartily to beseech the Lord our God to turn away the heavy chastisements now threatening us, or mercifully to mitigate them, being comfortably assured that we shall not supplicate in vain, but that help will be graciously granted us from above. On such occasions the Ministers shall preach from such texts as may serve to set forth a proper knowledge of our sins, and of God's displeasure at them, and to lead the people to true repentance ; and they shall endeavor to apply the whole properly to the peculiar circumstances of the occasion, and the existing condition of the churches. Before and after the sermon, penitential psalms shall be sung, and the service shall then be closed with the prayer designated below for such occasions. And as it is designed to be a day of prayer, in which all the afflictions of Christianity are to be considered, the sermon itself shall be made somewhat shorter, in order to allow more time for including all conditions of men, and all existing cases of distress.

Of Sermons on Festival and Holy-days.

On Christmas, and the day following, the basis of our salvation, viz: the incarnation of the eternal son of God, and the personal union of the two natures in Christ, as set forth in the Scripture history of the Birth of Christ, shall be explained, together with the benefits flowing to us therefrom, as all is contained in the second part of the Catechism.

On the Sabbath intervening between Christmas and New-year's-day, (being the time when new Elders are elected), a sermon shall be preached upon the duties of the Elder's office. In this it shall be shown from the word of God, that this office is not ordained of men but by God, that it is necessary and useful for the edification and perpetuity of the Church, and that it is not an infringement upon the office of civil government, but distinct from it. It shall also be shown what belongs to the office of Elders, and by what considerations they should be incited to diligence in the discharge of its duties. Thus will the congregations be admonished to becoming submission and respect towards the Elders, and these to faithfulness and zeal in their office.

On Easter-day, and the Monday following the history of the Resurrection of Christ shall be the subject of preaching, so that the congregations may receive thorough instruction from the Sacred Scriptures, upon those two chief points of our christian faith, namely, that Jesus Christ arose from the dead on the third day, and that we too shall arise from the dead. And in order that this history may be the better understood, and more profit may be derived therefrom, Ministers shall commence the explanation of the narrative of the sufferings and death of Christ on *Invocavit* Sabbath, and continue it until Easter.

The festival of the Ascension of Christ, also, has its history, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles 1st chap., and Mark 16th chap., and Luke 24th chap.: on this day therefore, Ministers will preach upon that article of our faith, in which we confess that Jesus ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, and from thence will come to judge the quick and the dead.

On Whitsuntide, and the Monday following, the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles shall be the subject of the preaching.

Morning and Evening meetings for Prayer.

In all the larger towns, on all working-days, the people shall be assembled *every morning*, and, without singing, have a chapter of the Sacred Scriptures distinctly read to them, the substance of which, together with such of the principal doctrines therein contained as are most profitable for comfort, exhortation, and instruction, shall be

briefly and simply given. This shall be followed by the regular Morning-prayer in connection with the Lord's prayer, the whole service not to be extended much beyond a half-hour.

In like manner every evening, the Minister shall hold a similar exercise at a suitable hour, reading a chapter, explaining and improving it as above, and concluding with the Evening-prayer in connection with the Lord's-prayer.

Of the Preparatory Service.

On the afternoon of the day preceding the administration of the Lord's Supper, a sermon shall be preached upon the benefits and right observance of the same. At the same time also a true christian self-examination shall be instituted, according to the directions which the Minister will find in the Catechism, and in the formula for administering the Lord's Supper. On this occasion the evening prayer for the day may be omitted.

OF THE CATECHISM.

In the Christian Religion a Catechism is a brief and simple statement of the principal doctrines of our Religion, in the form of questions and answers, to be used orally in the instruction of the young and unlearned. For all pious people from the commencement of the Christian Church have been careful to instruct their children in the fear of the Lord, as well at home, as in schools and churches; and undoubtedly for the following reasons, which should also incite us thereto.

I. In the first place they knew well, that the natural depravity of the heart, would gain the ascendancy, and destroy both the ecclesiastical and civil authority, if not counteracted in time by wholesome instruction.

II. In the *next place*, they felt constrained to do so by the express command of God, seeing that the Lord saith: (Deut. 6; 7.) "And thou shalt teach these words (the ten commandments) diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

III. And *finally*, just as the children of the Israelites, after their circumcision, when they reached the years of understanding, were instructed in the mysteries of that sign of the covenant, as well as in the covenant of God itself, so also shall our children receive instructions concerning the Baptism they received in infancy, and the true christian faith and repentance, so that they may make a

proper confession of their faith before the whole congregation before they are admitted to the table of the Lord. This custom of using the Catechism, originating as it did in the command of God was maintained in the Christian Church, until malicious Satan, by means of Antichrist, destroyed this excellent regulation, as he also did all others that were good, and instead thereof substituted his deceitful daubings and flatteries,¹ and other abominations, which he called the true foundation. And whereas our more aged people were brought up under the Papacy, without Catechetical instruction, and may readily forget the leading doctrines of the Christian Religion it is thought necessary, that in villages and smaller towns on all Sabbaths, on which the Lords Supper is not celebrated, the minister before preaching shall read from the pulpit, distinctly and plainly several questions of the Catechism so that the entire Catechism may be publicly read at least twice in each year.

But inasmuch as the Catechism is written somewhat in detail, in order that it may not prove tedious and burdensome to less educated persons, and youth it has been thought best to designate the most important questions by an asterisk *, which they may be able to learn and understand, until they have advanced sufficiently in years and understanding to take up and comprehend the rest.

In larger towns the Catechism shall be taken up and explained more fully, on every Sabbath afternoon as directed above."

Hereupon follows the Heidleberg Catechism and the summary referred to a few pages back, with the principal texts quoted in full under each answer; and then the texts of Scripture for all stations and circumstances in life &c., with which the first general division of the Liturgy is closed. A translation of the principal prayers, given in the second part, is reserved for the next No. of the Review.

POST-SCRIPT.

Having but a day or two ago met with a recent issue of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, in which, among a variety of other things, they set forth some five or six *objections to Liturgies*, which are evidently considered conclusive upon the subject, I think it appropriate briefly to notice them in this connection, and expose what seems to me their utter imbecillity and unfairness.

"Presbyterians," it is said, "object to Liturgies because, 1. The

¹ „Schmierwerk u. Badenstreich,,!

Holy scriptures, particularly under the New Testament, prescribe no such forms, do not intimate their expediency, and especially do not impose them. The evidence is all the other way, showing that Christians prayed as they are moved by the Spirit, and expressed their wants, sins, and desires in their own language."

Good Richard Sibbes says (in that excellant volume of his published by this Board,) that the true "way to scan a reason is to see whether it will hold water or not." I fear if this test is applied to the above objection, it will hardly be found to hold enough even to moisten a preacher's lips for the announcement of a psalm or hymn. For where do the Holy Scriptures prescribe forms for congregational use in singing God's praises? Or where do they intimate their expediency, or impose them? Or what evidence is there that primitive Christians did not sing as they were moved by the Spirit, expressing their joyful praises in their own language, at least at times, and especially when they spoke with tongues or prophesied? Is it said that the Scriptures furnish the Psalms of David? So too do they furnish the prayers of Jacob, of Moses, of Gideon, of Hannah, of David, of Solomon, of Hezekiah, of Isaac, of Manasseh, of Ezra, of Nehemiah, of Habakkuk, of Zechariah, the father of the Baptist, of Simeon, and above all the great Pattern-prayer which our Lord gave to His disciples at their own request (instead of telling them to go and pray from their hearts, whatever came uppermost,) and the Sacerdotal prayer of Jesus Christ contained in the 17th chap. of John. If therefore the objection urged above, against all forms of prayer be valid, must we not burn our hymn-books too?

2. "No man can be so intimately acquainted with the hearts of all other men as to express their precise views, feelings, wants and desires, and hence precomposed forms, which are to meet the cases of Christianity under all the varying circumstances of the world, must necessarily be inadequate."

And what follows then? Why evidently these four things. *First.*—We must have no Liturgies, as above stated. *Secondly.*—There should be no oral public prayer by Ministers—for what Minister can be so intimately acquainted with the hearts of all present in his congregation, as to express their precise views, &c., &c.; and if none, how inadequate and inappropriate must such prayers be! But who would submit to this? Surely it will suggest itself to every reflecting mind, that whilst there are indeed individual cases

and circumstances, which no public prayer, whether it be written or extemporaneous, can fully reach, the *general wants* and condition of all christians are so nearly the same, that they may be more befittingly comprehended in a written form, than if left to the accidental diction of those whose sermons, (as alas ! may be the case with too many of us) allow them no time to meditate upon their prayers before they rise to offer them. With but occasional exceptions (*for which all our German Protestant Liturgies make provision*) we have the same sins to confess, the same mercies to thank God for, the same general and particular favors to crave, on each sabbath of the year. The difficulty therefore on which this objection rests is purely a fiction.

Thirdly.—No prepared psalmody dare be used in our churches. For our psalms and hymns express in various metres, the supposed views and feelings, wants, joys and desires, of those for whose use they are designed. But if these cannot be sufficiently well pre-conceived to be expressed in plain and solemn prose, how can they be expressed in less pliant poetry ? Or if one or another of the hymns or psalms should exactly suit the case of one half of the congregation, how are the feelings of the other portion to be met ? And how finally is the Minister at all events, by whom the particular hymns to be sung are selected, to determine his choice among the seven or eight hundred before him ? How shall he be kept from announcing the 51st Psalm, when the state of feeling amongst the majority of his congregation would be far better expressed by the 71st., 2nd part ? And yet if I am to receive the objection stated as valid, it leaves me defenceless against the unmusical Quaker, and when he mocks at the songs of my Zion I can only blush or weep.

So it follows *in the fourth place*, if this objection be a good one, that after all *silent worship*, as they have it at the corner of 4th and Arch, is most consistent with the Bible, individual devotion, and common sense !

3. " Liturgies are an unwarrantable infringement of Christian liberty. It is incredible that God ever intended a man, under the strong emotions of repentance, faith, hope and love, to be confined in the expression of these emotions to a form of prayer, written, perhaps, by one insensible to such strong feelings; and it is incredi-

ble that it was ever designed to make men use from week to week, forms of prayer which do not express their present emotions."

This is in substance a repetition of the previous objection, only more warmly and eloquently expressed, perhaps under an irritating conviction of its weakness. It has therefore been met already. It may be added however, that all Protestant Liturgies bear very strong proofs of having been composed or compiled by very good men, by men who felt what they introduced into them, and who appear prayerfully to have sought divine guidance in their work. The Liturgy for instance, of which translated specimens have been given above appears to me to be the work of men of as deep and fervent piety, as those who wrote the Confession of Faith, or the Shorter Catechism. As for other Liturgies they may speak for themselves, which some at least are well able to do. Besides all these forms of prayer &c. are designed to deepen and animate Christian devotion, and stir up those whose emotions may be languid or cold. And doubtless good prayers are as well adapted to do this as soul-reviving hymns. And where is the Christian that has not often had his dull faith and lukewarm affections aroused and kindled by Watt's version of the 5th, 25th, 86th, 116th, &c., &c., Psalms, or by those precious Hymns,

"Ye humble souls, approach your God, &c."

"Awake my soul in joyful lays, &c."

"Plunged in a gulf of dark despair, &c."

"How sweet the name of Je-sus sounds, &c."

and scores besides? Did they ever interfere with his inward emotions? Were they not rather pinions to aid their upward flight? Or channels all cut and cleared, through which their gushing joys could flow on with less impediment, and greater peace? If then, my Brother, you and I, with many others, have often experienced this, how can we accept of the objection urged against such welcome aids?

4. "All Liturgies, however well prepared, must necessarily, from constrained and constant repetition, produce lifelessness and formality in devotion, and hence they are always most acceptable to those who have least spirituality of mind, and know least of the power of godliness."

It seems then the previous objection implied a little too much,

and needed some qualification. Liturgies *may* be well prepared—and need not necessarily be the production of one *insensible to the strong emotions of piety*. Let credit be given for this acknowledgement. As to the other part of this fourth objection, it is so uncharitable a libel on thousands and tens of thousands in Europe, England and America, that I wish to have nothing to do with it—and therefore prefer submitting it to an arbitration of seven creditable and orthodox men, of whom I will take the liberty of choosing the following three, *viz*: Zwingli, Luther and Calvin; three may be chosen by the objectors, and the six select an umpire. Before such a tribunal the point at issue may be left without an argument.

In addition to the above two other objections are given, the one on the ground that Liturgies cannot be adapted to seasons of emergency, and the other on the ground that every pious Minister must consider it a grievance to be hampered by the prayers of men who lived hundreds of years ago, and of whose piety he knows nothing &c. These have in effect been answered already, and so need occupy no further space.

In conclusion I cannot forbear thinking that their logic must indeed be lame in the feet, who must grasp such crutches to support it. And still more, how painful is the evident want of upright Christian candor betrayed in objections like those stated! The writer of them could hardly fail to see and feel their pitiful weakness. And yet he was willing, in order to strengthen the prejudices of others, or his own, to palm them off, on as many as may not be able at once to detect their fallacy, as good substantial reasons against the use of Liturgies! Is this consistent with christian honesty? Is it consistent with the spirit of earnest religious inquiry now abroad in the world? What can be gained by such theological card-shuffling? Even if it do silence for the moment rising fears in anxious godly souls, (like oil the troubled spring), what good will be effected in the end? Is it thus the children should be fed at the Shepherd's hands? If not then why when they ask for a fish, give them a serpent? Or when they entreat an egg, give them a scorpion? Or when they beg for bread, hand them a stone? Oh! for christian candor and honesty in these discussions upon the most momentous topics that can engage the head or heart of an inquiring Church!

If Liturgies are evil and unscriptural, let us have, not cunning

appeals to stupid prejudices for it, but good, sound reasons in proof thereof. If they are evil and pernicious, and our modern Presbyterian Brethren are right in their opposition, then let them be at once banished, nevermore to be recalled. But if they are not, and Presbyterianism has erred in opposing them, why let us have an open, and manly confession of the error. What is Presbyterianism, or Prelacy, what is Lutheranism, or the Reform, what is any thing under the sun, in contrast with the truth! Let us then have the confession though some Church dignity should thereby be compromised. The honor of the *Truth* is after all of infinitely more moment, than that of Puritan Presbyterianism! Neither has this latter any where claimed infallibility!

Easton, Pa.

J. H. A. B.

HYMN.

Fleeting, fleeting, ah, how fleeting
 With a footfall lightly sped,
 O'er the living, by the dead,
 Wearied never, hastening ever,
 Time pursues his silent tread.

Still retreating—still retreating,
 Through the years which God hath given,
 Borne along our lives are driven,
 Pausing never, passing ever,
 Like the drifting clouds of heaven.

Parting, meeting—parting, meeting!
 Fitful tides the heart doth know,
 Springs of joy and wells of wo,
 Failing never, mingling ever—
 One their current as they flow!

THEE entreating—THEE entreating,
 Hear, oh, LORD, we now implore!
 May we claim, life's changes o'er
 Ending never, spending ever,
 Blessed Eternity our dower!

Pittsburg, December, 1849.

R. P. N.

FAITH, REVERENCE AND FREEDOM.

A Baccalaureate Address to the Graduating Class in Marshall College, Sept. 12, 1849.

YOUNG GENTLEMEN.—Your academical career is ended. A long course of study indeed, as well as a long course of action, should your lives be spared, still lies before you in the new stadium you are now called to enter, to whose claims and responsibilities we trust you may all be found faithful. But the days of your College life, forming the period of general discipline and training for all the literary professions, the most interesting part of his existence to the reminiscence of the scholar, are at length all numbered and complete. You have taken your first degree in the liberal arts, and with the solemnities of this day *commence* your proper citizenship in the great republic of letters, under sacred pledge to your *alma mater*, and this witnessing cloud of friends now present, that you will not disgrace in time to come such truly honorable distinction. In compliance with long established venerable usage, I improve the opportunity of the parting moment to which we have now come, while your feet still linger by the threshold of relations here made to cease forever, and our hand is extended in the office of its last benediction and farewell, in my own name and in the name of all your teachers here present, to speak a few words of final counsel and advice; which we beg you to carry along with you, as the legacy of our affectionate regard, into the hard and difficult world, on whose stepmotherly bosom you are hereafter to be cast. We cannot pretend of course, at such a time, to say all that our hearts might prompt, or the nature of the occasion suggest. We must prefer what is general to that which is particular, and even in such form we may not pretend to cover the whole field of practical wisdom and duty. Enough that we try to fix upon your thoughts a few primary and central interests of morality, that may be felt to commend themselves to regard as specially needful for the mission of life at the present time, without account of much besides that might be worthy of presentation in the some general view. Let me hold up here then to your earnest consideration three grand objects especially, to which we have endeavored to have regard in the conduct of your education thus far, and of which you are bound never to lose sight in the activity of your whole subsequent lives, *Faith, Reverence and Freedom*. Our parting counsel, at present, gathers itself up into this threefold interest. Cultivate faith in the existence of

the invisible and eternal ; cherish reverence for the absolute and universal ; seek the true freedom of the spirit in its own sphere of necessary self-moving law. Only so can you be true to yourselves. Only so can you hope to be either truly useful or truly honorable, in your generation.

Cultivate, earnestly and constantly, the power of **FAITH**. Man carries in his constitution the life of two worlds. Under one aspect he belongs to the system of Nature, as it stands revealed to sense in the forms of space and time. The organism of nature completes itself in him, as its proper consummation and head. In this view, he is comprehended in its economy, and dependent perpetually upon its power. By his senses and appetites he is bound to it, through the whole course of his history, as the necessary ground and substratum of his very being. He is the child and creature of the earth, linked in close sympathy with its universal life, from the cradle to the grave. However far his nature may rise towards heaven, it is a column still which can never make its escape in full from the material basis in which it starts ; it can never so effloresce into the form of spirit, as to lose all connection with the root that underlies it in the form of flesh and sense. But this is only one side of our constitution. Under another aspect, Man belongs, by original and native right, to a higher order of existence, the purely spiritual world, as it lies beyond nature altogether, and includes in itself laws and powers to which mere nature can never ascend. He is made in the image of God ; which implies the light of self-knowledge and the power of free will, something wholly independent of the world in every lower form, in virtue of which only he is qualified to be its centre and head. The life of man in this form is a new power or force brought into the bosom of nature, which can never be resolved into its previous action, and which is required accordingly to unfold and complete itself as its own product. Reason and Will spring not from the world of sense, but from a higher sphere of existence, which sense has no power of itself to apprehend or penetrate. At the same time, they are so wedded to matter and sense in our human constitution, that they cannot unfold themselves at all without this union. The case requires accordingly, not only that the spiritual principle should be autonomic, the spring and the law at once of its own action, but also that it should in this character lay hold of the material principle, the conditional basis and inseparable adjunct of its own life, in such a way that this may be converted throughout into a passive organ simply for its service and use. The harmony and perfection of our existence

demand, not the destruction of nature within us, nor yet a violent divorce of the spirit from its conjugal claims, but the unity of a true marriage, in which the spirit shall be supreme and nature appear as a willing and loving handmaid by its side. This is the true conception of human life, this is the great problem of virtue and religion which every man is called to fulfil, in his particular time and place. To do so effectually, it is plain that he must stand in living earnest connection and communion with the spiritual world, from which his own spirit springs, and in virtue of whose resources only it can have either vocation or power to assert the supremacy of which we now speak. This communication with the spiritual world is accomplished by *faith*; which is simply the capacity or organ our nature carries in itself as spirit for perceiving and apprehending spiritual things, the realities of a higher world, as sense is the organ through which we stand in union with things seen and temporal. It forms emphatically thus the bond that joins us, in a real and living way, with the *pleroma* of life in God; and it is easy to see, how immeasurably needful it is that it should be always at hand as an open channel, through which fresh supplies of light and strength from that boundless fountain may be poured into our souls, to fit them for the work and conflict to which they are called.

Faith is at once a source of enlargement and strength for the human spirit, by the very posture into which this is brought by its means. Every thing is strong, in union only with the general ground of its being, and such union is necessary to make it complete in its own separate position. So reason and will in man come to their full force, only as they are brought to fall back consciously and freely upon their own proper foundation in God. Faith serves thus to bring its possessor subjectively into the full use of his spiritual nature, under the most favorable form. To be under the power of mere sense, to be thrown upon the course of this world naturally considered as the end and whole meaning of life, is to be at the same time necessarily more or less impotent and unfree. Faith brings with it the feeling of health, the sense of order, the consciousness of strength. It is more in this respect than all opportunity and education besides; for it goes to the inmost core of our being, and makes room for it to pour forth, from the deepest fountain of its vitality, the full force of its own contents. It forms the true completion of our human state, its climax and crown, its only normal habit, in comparison with which every other condition is to be regarded as defective

and out of rule. The man, in whom it reigns, verifies wherever found the magnificent simile of the first psalm. He is like the green and stately palm tree, planted by the rivers of water ; "that bringeth forth his fruit in his season : his leaf also shall not wither ; and whatsoever he doeth, shall prosper."

This personal enlargement involves however a real participation in the life and power of the invisible world itself, towards which the soul thus erects itself by the power of faith. It is not in imagination only, but in the way of actual fact, that it passes over the limits of nature, and connects itself with the vast spiritual economy which lies beyond. Faith is the substance or hypostasis of things hoped for, the evidence or authentication of things not seen ; the very ladder, we may say, that joins earth and heaven together, on which the angels of God are seen ascending and descending always as the ministers of their glorious communion. The man who believes in God, truly and really, is brought by such creed into union and communion with God himself, and enters to the same extent into the bosom of that everlasting order, whose seat is the Divine Mind, and which holds the universe in its place. He dwells in God, as the very ground of his own intelligence and will, and receives into himself, in the same proportion, the light and activity of the adorable WORD, the medium of all God's revelations in the world, the one single source and full comprehension at once of all truth, all law, all life. Faith in this way gives its subject a present citizenship in the skies ; surrounds him with the scenery of heaven ; causes him to hear in his soul the music of the spheres ; brings him to bathe in the pure liquid of uncreated light ; sets him in full harmony with the counsels of the Almighty ; draws into him, with unceasing stream, the powers of the spirit world. Is it any wonder, such vast and glorious results are attributed to it in the Bible ? How can it fail to purify the heart, and form it to every noble and generous sentiment ? Can one thus hold communion with the skies, and not be transformed gradually into the same image ? May one walk with angels, and not grow angelic in his own soul ? And how again should such faith not prove the "victory that overcometh the world ?" It is the spear of Ithuriel, whose touch at once brings all forms of Satanic mischief to their proper shape, and compels them to confess their own worthlessness and shame. It is powerful alike against the false pleasures of the world, and against its terrors and alarms ; superior at once to its frowns and to its smiles. Greatest of all, it overcomes the bad power *self*, and enables a man to bring his own life thus into harmony with its original law, without which it is

not possible for him to possess true harmony or strength in any other view. The greatest of all achievements for any of you in this world, is the mastery of yourselves ; for this implies the free subordination of your natural life to the authority of the spirit, not as an isolated self, but as the universal principle of truth and order in the world ; in which view it involves, of course, at the same time, the supremacy of the spirit over the whole constitution of nature, as originally designed in man's creation. Well may it be said accordingly : "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."

Faith has respect to all God's revelations. Of these the last and most perfect, is that which is presented to us by the glorious mystery of the incarnation, proclaimed in the New Testament, and always at hand in the Church. This, as it goes beyond all other revelations, completes at the same time the sense of all, and throws back upon them a depth of significance which they would not otherwise possess. We cannot have faith in God then, as he reveals himself in nature and providence, except as we have power to see and know his presence in Christ and the Church. He is the light of the world, the Sun that forms the centre of the spiritual universe, and communicates to it all its beauty and glory ; whom *not* to follow, is to "walk in darkness, without the light of life." He is the inmost reason of creation, the last sense of all God's works and ways, the Everlasting Word made Flesh. By him, we have access to the Father. Through him, the powers of the higher world are made to unite themselves, in a real and abiding way, with the wants of our fallen life. He is the Son of Man, by whom and in whom the Divine Spirit is fully revealed in the world as the principle of the new creation, and through whom the angels of God carry forward the full correspondence of earth and heaven, (John i : 54) as symbolically seen in Jacob's vision. Have faith then in Christ. Let him be to you, in the whole mystery of the incarnation, the surest and deepest of all truths, the most necessary and near of all facts. This will bring with it a corresponding faith in the presence of God under other forms. He will be seen in Nature. He will be felt in History. The whole world will be found to be full of his glory.

Who shall utter the value and importance of such faith, in such an age especially as this, for all who are called, as you are, to take some active part in the conduct of the world's affairs. The age is full of commotion, revolution and change. Evidently we are in the midst of a vast crisis or process of transition,

by which a new character is to be given hereafter to the universal state of humanity. Old things are passing away. Foundations of long standing are in many cases ready to give way. Darkness and confusion are settling on much that once seemed firm and clear. Powers of hell, not unfrequently transformed into angels of light, are on all sides actively at work. Politics, science, and religion, are all unsettled, and more or less torn with inward conflict. There is much in every direction to confound the wisdom of the wise, and to fill with apprehension the stout heart of the strong and brave. The tendencies of the age especially are in many respects powerfully adapted, to beget scepticism and doubt in regard to all that lies beyond the present world. It shows itself, to a fearful extent, materialistic, rationalistic, titanically bent on storming the heavens by its own strength. It is something high and solemn, to go forth and wrestle with the great problem of human life, in such a period of vast tumultuating strife. You may have some sense of this possibly to day ; but it is no such sense as you will have of it hereafter, if earnestly true to your own mission, when you shall have fairly gone forth into this great and wide sea, and are called to grapple with its waves and billows in their own wild strength. Who can say in what midnight eclipse the stars of heaven shall not seem to go out, in all directions, over your head ? Who may tell what vortices of doubt, what rocks of grim discouragement and despair, shall not present themselves in your way ? One thing is certain. Outward forms, rules and traditions, as they might serve for the tolerable administration of life in more settled periods, will not answer this purpose now. Mere opinions and notions are not sufficient to preserve the path of men at any time ; but least of all in such a time as this, when the whole moral world is agitated and convulsed with the throes of mighty revolution. To stand erect in such an age ; to be firmly faithful to the great trust of life ; to make common cause throughout with truth and virtue ; to bear up manfully against surrounding darkness, difficulty and fear ; to be of quick intelligence to discern what is right, and of resolute will to follow it in the way of constant earnest obedience ; you need above all things faith in God, in the moral order of the universe, in the divine fact of Christianity. Without Christ, the world is indeed no better than a spiritual chaos, in the midst of its greatest prosperity and glory. His presence on the other hand brings order into it, and spans it with the rainbow of hope, when it is otherwise most dismal, confused, and dark. Through all revolutions, he remains the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever. In the midst of all clouds and

darkness, righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne. With Christ in the vessel, History can never be the sport merely of the winds and waves. The gates of hell never have prevailed, and never shall prevail, against his Church. "Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea ; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof."

Cultivate again the principle of REVERENCE. This rests upon faith as its necessary foundation, and is at the same time the necessary product and fruit of it, wherever it prevails. It has regard to the spiritual and invisible, and is the homage the soul pays to that which is higher and more comprehensive than itself, under its own form of existence. We reverence not nature, but spirit ; and we reveal, in doing so, the spirituality of our own being, and its native affinity with the object awakening such lofty sentiment. The animal has no reverence. It dwells not in the bosom of brutish men. On the other hand, there can be no true culture without it. Imagine a man of the highest intellectual order, gifted with all natural endowments and graced with all educational accomplishments, but still insensible to the claims of Mind and Law in their universal form, as something older and immeasurably greater than himself, and you have still at best a column only of Parian marble in human shape, the solitary grandeur of a pyramid in the midst of boundless sand. Without reverence, Gabriel himself would be poor and mean.

All reverence carries in it an acknowledgment of God, as its ultimate object and ground ; and it involves also, essentially, the conception of God as an intelligent personal Being, and not simply in the form of an infinite abstraction. Even where this may not be clearly perceived, and the mind seems to be overwhelmed only with the sense of the absolute as a merely natural power, the true interior spring of its emotion is still always the obscure apprehension of a divine *Life* behind this, which is felt to underlie all in the character of self-existent Thought and Will. Such an emotion, even in the breast of a Spinoza, is the involuntary tribute of the human spirit to the fountain of its own life, which serves of itself to demonstrate, against all intervening speculation, its true living reality as the self-conscious ground of the universe. There can be no reverence for a universal Fate, or universal Chance ; as little as it can be said to be due to a blind whirlwind or to the roaring of a forest lion. Only in the presence of the Divinity, apprehended as free, self-moving, all embracing Spirit, and only in the sense of our relation to it as

the centre and end of our own being, can any such sentiment legitimately fill our minds.

But now it would be a grand mistake again, on the opposite hand, to suppose that because all reverence has regard ultimately to God, in the way here affirmed, there can be no room for its exercise towards any object less than God. 'This would be, in truth, to fall into the very abstraction, which the case requires, as we have already seen, that we should religiously avoid. It is not the absolute as such simply, but the absolute in the form of self-revelation, God in the world, God unfolding his glory to the view of angels and men, before which our spirits are required thus to bow. In this view, Nature itself may be the object of reverence; not on its own account, outwardly considered; but as it serves to manifest to the view of faith the sublime presence, and wonderful attributes, of Him who dwells in it, and makes it the perpetual mirror of his glory. Reverence is due to the NAME of God, wherever it comes to utterance in any way, in the stars of heaven or in the flowers of the field, in rolling seas or everlasting hills, in the birds of the air, the fish of the sea, and the beasts of the forest. The universe of nature, as a whole and in all its parts, is not merely the sign of what God is, but the very symbol and sacrament of his presence, a true revelation, as far as it goes, of his "eternal power and Godhead." The heavens declare the glory of God; the firmament sheweth his handiwork; day unto day uttereth speech; night unto night proclaimeth knowledge. Reason and speech enter into their very constitution; they are a vast magnificent *word*, speaking forth always the awful majesty of Jehovah. By the WORD of the Lord in truth the heavens are, and the host of them by the *breath* of his mouth. So again, where religion has come in with new and more full revelation under a strictly supernatural form, the outward and natural may be employed still farther to embody and represent the divine and spiritual, by special inward conjunction more or less sacramental, so as to have part in its title to reverential respect. We are commanded thus to reverence God's sanctuary, his holy altar, and the solemn mysteries of his worship. In all these cases, our reverence passes at once *through* the object of sense to that which lies beyond and behind, the idea of the invisible God himself; the first is the medium only and vehicle of the sentiment, not in any sense its end. God however reveals himself in the world not merely by such outward symbols, which themselves have no part in the life of spirit, and so are shadows only of the divine substance they are made to enshrine; but still more gloriously also through the

world of mind itself, in virtue of which the very image and likeness of his own nature look forth upon us from the bosom of the universe, under a created form. This is entitled to our reverence always, not only as the shrine of something higher, but also for its own sake; though only for its own sake again, of course, as it is felt to be comprehended in that which is more general than itself separately considered, and so finally in the Universal Mind itself, forth from which as a parent fountain all other minds proceed. Man thus, in his single capacity, becomes an object worthy of veneration even with angels; because his personality, constituted by reason and will, sets him in real union with the very being of spirit under its universal form, and makes him to be something far more, in this view, than his own individual life as such. "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." God did not simply make him from the dust of the ground, in the beginning, but breathed into him also a portion of his own life, and so constituted him a living soul.

As such an efflux from God, still bound through every point of its separate existence with the ocean of light and love from which it proceeds, the human spirit everywhere challenges our awful respect. We are bound to reverence it, in all men. Even an infant may claim, in such view, the inmost homage of our hearts; for it carries in its tiny life potentially the high and holy mystery of self-acting intelligence, in comparison with which the sun itself is a very small thing. It is related of Leonidas, the father of the celebrated Origen, that he would at times kiss reverentially the breast of his little son, while he lay asleep, as though he felt the presence of the spirit that dwelt there to be higher and greater than himself. There is something beautiful and sublime in that. It carries the true and perfect stamp of Christianity. So should we all reverence our children, and treat them from the beginning as temples of the Holy Ghost. No man can have any true reverence for God, who has not yet learned, or who has forgotten, to entertain reverence for his image as it lies hid in the person of a child. Thus reverencing others, we are led to exercise the same sentiment also towards ourselves. This is something world-wide apart from pride and self-glorification. Such a habit springs from the want of faith in the true nature of spirit, leading its subject to affect a private and separate independence, which is in full violation of all truth and reason. It is only when the man recognizes in himself the presence of a life broader than his own, and finds his consciousness complete as a drop only in the sea of intelligence with which it

is surrounded, that he is at once delivered from selfishness and inspired at the same time with the most profound self-respect.

This of itself implies, however, that our reverence for the single reason and will, whether in ourselves or in other men, is conditioned necessarily by a corresponding regard to reason and will in their more general form. As in the case of Nature, so too in the world of Mind, the individual existence is comprehended always in the bosom of the whole to which it belongs. God reveals himself, in the form of self-acting spirit, not by inspiring truth and law into every man separately taken; that would be as monstrous a supposition as to imagine all natural objects made separately and put together like an orrery or watch; but by a single inspiration rather, or breath of the Almighty, which is at once as broad and full as the compass of our whole Humanity. Our acknowledgement of his authority then in this form, can never be genuine and full, save as it is *mediated* by a due respect to the living organism of mind, through which alone it is brought to challenge our regard. What we are required to reverence here, as before in the constitution of the outward world, is a divine revelation, an actual self-manifestation of God's glory or name; which in this case meets us, however, in the form of created intelligence and will, and not as before in the form simply of blind nature. This system of created intelligence and will, the life of man in its general or collective character, is itself the revelation we are bound to acknowledge and respect. And do we ask now, in what way this homage is exacted at our hands? The answer is plain. Through the ethical constitution of society (itself God's work,) as it starts in the Family, rises into the State, and completes itself at last in the glorious idea of the Church. Rightly considered, nothing can be more absurd than for men to pretend any true respect for God's will, while they show no respect for these institutions by which his will is carried over into the actual order of the world. The worst of all heresies indeed, as false to philosophy as it is to religion, is comprehended in the imagination, that reason and will are the private property simply of those to whom they belong, by means of which they are called to transact the great work of truth and righteousness directly and immediately with God himself, in an abstract and separate way. Such private judgment and private will may indeed pretend a more than usual regard for the authority of God, as not enduring the intervention of any other authority less absolute than his own; but this is only to substitute in truth an empty thought for a divine reality. God's truth and God's will come not to men, not even

through the Bible itself, in any such abstract and naked style ;¹ and so to be the object at all of reverence or faith, they must be apprehended as a real revelation, under the form of life and spirit in the actual structure of the human world. No child can reverence God a whit farther than it is imbued with reverence for its parents. To despise authority, to speak evil of dignities, to be given to revolution and change, is the mark universally of an irreligious and profane mind. Radicalism and Red Republicanism, however loudly they may prate of religion, reason and right, are as irreverent towards God as they show themselves always in the end selfish and cruel also towards men. In the Church too, the same spirit is ever distinguished by the same bad character. It is the very mother of schisms and sects, ill favored, hard and harsh, from whose presence every sweet charity of the true christian life shrinks affrighted away. Reverence for the Church is the necessary condition, all the world over, of reverence for God and reverence for Christ.

The revelation of God however, under the form now in view, is not something at once finished and complete from the beginning. On the contrary it is accomplished in the way of history. In this respect, the world of mind differs from the world of mere nature. This last has no history, in the true sense of the term, except as we may choose to conceive of a vast cosmogony going before its present state, and making room for it in the way affirm-

¹ Inspiration itself forms no exception to this rule. Plainly the supernatural vision of the prophets is conditioned always by the character of their natural life, which holds of course in organic connection with the reigning religious life of their age. To conceive of the psalms of David or the oracles of Isaiah flowing from the lips of a child, would be an offence against true faith, the same in kind, though not in degree, with the imagination of their having proceeded from Balaam's ass. So the inspiration of David or Isaiah cannot be *rationally* imagined competent, in any way, to reveal what comes to light under wholly new circumstances, in the mind of Paul. The inspiration of Paul again is not the inspiration of Peter or James or John ; and *could not be so* without magic. Any theory of inspiration which implies the contrary is false, and dishonorable to religion. Inspired prophets, (in this respect like uninspired poets, only in far higher view,) moved supernaturally by the Holy Ghost, are notwithstanding, and indeed for this very reason, the birth and product of their own time, the central organs of their generation, in which the inmost meaning of its life comes to apprehension and utterance. Their oracles are no abstractions, Delphic riddles, wizard vaticinations. They are not of any *private* interpretation, (2 Peter i : 20,) but belong to the true universal life of the world. They come medially *through* the organization of the religious life, as an existing whole at the time, and not by any means as abrupt meteors shot from the clouds.

ed by geologists. Humanity, on the other hand, is plainly a process, by which one generation is required continually to carry forward the sense of another. History becomes thus, in a deep sense, nothing less than a divine *anthropogony*, by which the universal life of man, in the form of reason and will is moving forward always to its grand completion. It becomes plain at once, in this way, what sort of homage and respect it is entitled to claim at our hands. Shall we own God's presence in Nature, and take it by faith for the sure guaranty of order, reason and law, even in the whirlwind and earthquake; and shall we then turn round, and say of *History*, the revelation of Spirit, in which that other revelation finds its whole sense and end: It is chaos without form and void, or a sea of chance whose waves roar eternally the same hollow sound? Shall there be a divine teleology in the universe of matter, and neither end nor plan in the universe of mind? Must we see God in the stars, must we hear him in the storm and in the breeze, must we converse with him through the flowers of the field, and yet have no power to perceive his stately goings in the far more awful sanctuary of the human spirit, carried forward by successive generations towards its proper consummation? There is blasphemy in the very thought. History is no chaos. Earth has not been thus forsaken of Heaven, in the highest sphere of her life. We may find much here to bewilder and confound our thoughts, deep places of providence that we have no power to fathom or comprehend, Gordian knots that all our ingenuity and wisdom are employed in vain to solve; but still notwithstanding all this, we are bound to believe that history, as a whole, is divinely rational, and that it embodies in itself under such view the power of a moral authority, which reason and piety alike require all men to respect. It is not possible to have any sense of the organic constitution of the world, by which the general reason and will become the medium of divine revelation for individual men, without being made to feel to the same extent the intimate and necessary connection of this general life with itself in the flow of time; for every generation grows forth plainly from that which goes before, and must be regarded as the product and result accordingly of all previous history. We cannot reverence the present truly, in any of its institutions, except as we reverence also the past. The individualism, which affects to place private judgment and private will over all authority of a general kind, is characterised always by a corresponding contempt for the world which has come to be in its rear. Radicalism and Sectarianism are by their very constitution unhistorical. They will have it that reason and law start

with themselves, as a direct gift from the Almighty; and to make room for this proud pretension, they turn the whole past life of the world profanely into a moral nullity, or it may be into something much worse. Not to have faith in history however, and not to reverence it as a true revelation of God's mind and will is simply to be without true faith and reverence towards God himself. An undevout astronomer, it has been said, is mad, can he be less so, who is not led to bow in reverence before the Infinite Mind at work in History, but sees in it rather the very opposite only of intelligence and order?

Cultivate, finally, the life and power of true **FREEDOM**. Man is formed to be free. It lies in the very conception of intelligence, that it should be a law to itself, and not obey blindly and mechanically a power foreign to its own nature. Self-consciousness, the image of God in man, completes itself in self-activity. Truth becomes fully actual in the world, only where it passes into the form of freedom; which may be said for this reason, to constitute the crown and glory of the whole creation. No wonder, that such an interest should be held universally in high account, where any sense is had, though it be never so darkly, of the original and proper dignity of our nature. All slavery is an ignominious wrong, which the human spirit can never patiently and quietly endure, without degradation. It is the duty of all men, as well as their divine prerogative, to be free.

Few however have any right conception of freedom. It is taken, for the most part, to consist in the mere outward liberty, by which men are allowed to use their lives according to their own will, without restraint or coercion from abroad; or what is but little better, in that simply civil or political liberty, which stands in the assertion of what are conceived to be the original and inalienable rights of men, under some abstract scheme of law. None but actual madmen are so foolish indeed as to disown all limitation, in the case of their private mind and will. Society could not exist, even under the rudest form, without law; and law implies objective restraint. But the conception now noticed severs the will from the law; makes them to stand altogether out of each other; and so places the value of liberty still, at last, in the supposed independence wholly of the first separately considered. According to the most gross form of this theory, men relinquish in society certain privileges and rights, which belong to them as individuals, in order the more effectually to secure those that are still reserved. By a more refined view, the law demanding such surrendry is regarded as a divine constitution, which men are bound to accept as the necessary condition

of their social existence; in which case accordingly it is incumbent on the will in the exercise of its independence, to consent to the limitation as wholesome and good, while it expatiates then all the more freely within these bounds as its own lord and master. The two views come in the end to very much the same result. The will has its being in both cases on the outside of the law; the relation between the two is a sort of mercantile contract; obedience resolves itself into mere prudential calculation and policy. In all this we have no freedom, but spiritual mechanism and bondage. Such is the result, however, into which the fiction of abstract rights and private judgment must ever run, when left to its own course.

In full opposition to every fiction of this sort, the true idea of freedom meets us, only where rights cease to be abstract and merge themselves in the sense of society as a living whole, only where judgment and will lay aside their merely private character and show themselves as universal as the law itself. Liberty is an ethical fact, which stands just in this that the single will, in virtue of that divine autonomy or self-motion which belongs to it by its creation, flows over the boundaries of the individual life in which it has its rise, and makes itself one with the pure ether of truth that surrounds it, the glorious sea of light in which it is carried and borne. In other words, authority, law, truth as something objective and universal, is just as much a constituent of true freedom, as the single will by which in any case it is brought to pass. Will in no union with law, will sundered from the idea of authority and objective necessity, will in this way purely private and not general, can never be free. The one conception is the precise opposite of the other. And yet we hear, on all sides, authority opposed to freedom, as though the one must necessarily exclude the other! Never was there a greater mistake, or one more practically mischievous. Not only are the two necessarily conjoined in an outward way, so that where the law ends liberty must end at the same time, and in the sense of Voltaire's maxim, if there were no God it would still be necessary to invent one to keep the world in order; they flow together inwardly also in every free act, and in such union form but the power of a single indissoluble fact. The law is not simply the measure of liberty, but its very substance and soul. So far is it from being true that authority and independence oppose each other, the last has its very being only in the sense of the first. To reverence authority is to be free. To despise it, is to have the mind and heart of a slave.

It has not been without reason then, that Faith and Reverence

have been made to go before Freedom, in the present address. They form in truth its original foundation, and necessary condition, and constant element. All true authority springs from God. To believe in God, is to have the sense of authority, to be embosomed in the consciousness of law. And this consciousness, as we have now seen, constitutes the very substance of freedom. Faith inspires reverence ; this is the necessary posture and habit of the will, where such apprehension of the infinite prevails ; and the result of all is inward emancipation from the power of what is simply single and finite, whether as in the mind itself or out of it, and willing motion in the orbit of law ; such a marriage of the single and universal, in other words, as brings them to be one. This is freedom ; while all that falls short of it, is for the spiritual nature of man inglorious servitude and bondage. No man can be free, without reverence. No man can be free, without faith. Atheism, profanity and pride, are always unfree, cowardly and mean. The fear of the Lord, is the beginning of wisdom, the fountain and support of all strength in man, whether it be as light in his understanding or as active force in his will. "God hath not given us the spirit of fear," says one who was himself full of this divine heroism, "but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind."

The authority which freedom respects and obeys is of course always the will of God. All law, as well as all life, comes from this source alone. It must be well borne in mind however that we have to do with this, not as an abstraction brought nigh to us immediately in the way of mere thought, but as an actual self-manifestation of God's will in the living world of which we are a part. To believe in God, is as we have seen to discern and apprehend his presence and glory in Nature, in History, in the Bible, and above all in Christ ; not to dream of him simply as an unrevealed essence beyond the clouds, which can only be sport the semblance of faith with what is at last but the creature of our own brain. So also, we have seen, reverence towards God is the profound homage of the created spirit, rendered to him, not as the incomprehensible *Sige* or *Bythos* simply of the Gnostics, but as the omnipresent indwelling Life of the Universe, whose mind and will are perpetually announcing themselves in a real way, as the very word or voice of Jehovah, first in the constitution of Nature, and then far more gloriously still in the constitution of Spirit, both wedded into a single life in the constitution of Man. The order of the world is concrete. The law of creation is in it, not beyond it, either as physical or as moral. Men can never obey it as an abstraction. It is then a grand

Satanic delusion, when any pretend to be free by casting off all other forms of authority, to obey simply and exclusively, as they say, the authority of God under any such imaginary purely naked form. God's will touches no man in that way, either through the Bible or on the outside of it. It comes to every man in its full force at last, only through the medium of the actually living world, especially the living christian world, the Church ; which for this very reason is proclaimed " the ground and pillar of the truth," the Body of Christ, " the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." No man's reason or will is to be trusted who sets out with the assumption that he is the organ, directly and separately, of the Divine Mind, and in this view responsible to God only for his opinions and ways. Rather such assumption marks universally the want of true independence and freedom, as well as the very contrary of all genuine reverence and faith. It is the slang of infidelity itself, and low, coarse, selfish radicalism, in all its forms, thus to make everything of God and *self*, and nothing of all the world besides. The manly independence of a truly free mind, springs always from the apprehension of God's presence and authority, as something concretely revealed in the actual life of the world, and from this apprehension only. The law which it is urged willingly to obey, as a power more vast than itself, is felt to surround it as an awful spiritual Reality in the the constitution of the universe. There is an homage which true Freedom exercises, under this form, in the presence even of Nature. The man is not free, whose soul is moved to no reverence, no loving though awful sense of dependence, by the sea, by the stars, by the voice of God in the whirlwind and storm. But it is in the presence of Spirit far more under its own form, created mind, the intellectual and moral world, as not only the symbolic shadow or mirror but the very image and substance of the Divine Mind itself, that such homage finds its full value and sense. Freedom, in proportion as it is free, bows down reverentially, and is never so great and strong and glorious as when its obeisance is most complete, to all lawful authority, whether it be political, moral or religious. The obedience of a little child to the will of a father, or the command of a mother, involving such reverence and faith, is something more beautifully grand than the course of a planet round the sun. Such a child too is at once a more glorious spectacle of freedom and strength, than a whole army of Titans piling Ossa upon Pelion to take the heavens by storm.

I pity the man, who supposes that Freedom can begin, only where Authority ends. There may be indeed a slavish and ab-

ject sense of power, that brings with it only degradation and weakness. So in regard to Nature. It is the sign of an unfree mind to bestow upon it superstitious worship, or to cower tremblingly at its feet. But what then? Is the fool free, on the other hand, who can bring himself to mock and brave its terrors, or who can gaze upon its glories with the apathy of an ox? No! Even in this relation, freedom supposes and requires, not an abstract separation of the subjective from the objective, but the free loving acknowledgment rather of this last on the part of the first, as the measure and mirror of truth under its own outward form. When God rides upon the wings of the wind, or utters his voice in the majesty of the rolling thunder, true superiority to nature consists not in overlooking the awful fact, but in meeting it promptly with the reverence of an awe-struck spirit. And why then may not the same relation between the subjective and the objective, liberty and authority, extend itself also in all its force over into the moral world? It is indeed something base to crouch to authority here, in a merely outward way; just as all *fetichism* is base, when directed towards nature. But we ask again, what then? Is the remedy for such baseness, to be found in deriding and casting off all such authority, in the exercise of mere wanton self-will? Can it be less fool-hardy to despise parental government, civil government, church government, than it is to mock the lightning or brave the lion in his den? Am I bound to reverence God, and feel his law, in the constitution of the planets; and am I *not* bound to reverence him also, and feel his law, in the far more glorious constitution of Human Society and History? The question surely answers itself.

Strange that those who take Freedom to be the simple opposite of Authority, should not reflect that this must hold, if it be true, in regard to the highest form of authority, that which it carries in the Divine Mind itself, as well as in all inferior relations.¹ What is gained for the independence of the subject, by

¹ It is always a false and injurious conception of God's will, when it is thought of as arbitrary, and so as outward and foreign altogether, in its relation to men. God is not out of the world and beyond it, however truly different from it in his nature, but enters into its actual order as the ground and support continually of all its laws and powers. In the moral world accordingly he does not *make* reason and right, as something on the outside of himself, which created intelligences are then required to acknowledge out of regard simply to his absolute authority; but he is both reason and right under their most universal form; they subsist, wherever found, only in and by the living activity of his intelligence and will. Men are rational and free in God. His Personality is the absolute ground of all personality besides.

merely transferring the authority he is called to obey, from created will up to that which is uncreated and eternal, if the one is to remain at last wholly out of the other, each bound forever to its own sphere? It should be remembered, that there may be a craven spirit of submission towards God himself, as well as towards mere nature or mere human power. Indeed all submission is so, in which the will of the creature is not brought to enter into the will of the Creator as its own free life. But now if Freedom and Authority do not exclude each other in this highest relation, but on the contrary are required to flow together in this inward way, why should it be imagined that they are incompatible in any lower relation, legitimately belonging to the moral world? Why may not the man who disowns private judgment and private will, be just as free in the reverent use of established law and tradition, to say the least, as the man who scorns every such limitation; limiting himself in fact at the same time in order to be thus privately and narrowly free? Why should the traveller, who has learned to respect the universal civilized world, be less truly independent than the rude shepherd or farmer, to whom his native valley still stands for the measure of the earth entire? Why should the scholar at home in the broad empire of science, not be full as great when he bends to its vast objective laws, as the self-willed sciolist or pedant who sets them all at defiance? Why should the man who honors the Past, with large knowledge of its life, and bows down before History as a divine revelation, be less prepared to think and act safely, or less likely to be onesided and bound in his views, than his hard-minded neighbor, who tries all ages by his own century, and finds no sense or meaning in any, beyond this most unhistorical rule? Why should one who believes that Christ has been always present in the course of Christianity, according to his own promise, from the beginning, and who counts it a duty accordingly to study with reverent homage the footsteps of his majesty and grace through all ages, be less qualified to reach the true mind of Christ in the Bible; than another, whose extreme individualism makes light of the Creed, looks down upon the Fathers, sees chaos only in the Middle Ages, and finds universal Christianity thus at last reflected through the Bible, from the small and insignificant *Mantua* of his own untravelled mind?¹ Or yet once more, why should faith in the Holy Catholic Church, and reverence and sympathy for her voice, be held to be a less

¹ *Urbem, quam dicunt Romam, Melibœe, putavi
Stultus ego huic nostræ similem.*

genial and friendly element for the growth of that true christian liberty, wherewith the Son of God makes men free, than is the atmosphere of a Sect, with which all such reverence and sympathy are wanting, and for which its own brief and narrow tradition is of more weight than the "*ubique, semper et ab omnibus*," of whole Christendom besides?

Cultivate then, we say again, Faith, Reverence, and Freedom. Remember that to be truly free, you must be superior to yourselves, as well as to the surrounding world; and this you never can be, except as you stand in felt living communion with the spiritual world, and are made to do homage thus to truth and law as something vastly greater and more glorious than your own individual lives. This is the true perfection of your nature. This is your first vocation and mission in the world. This is the magnificent work, more high and glorious than all the labors of Hercules, which you are sent forth upon the arena of life to accomplish, and which the whole creation of God, surrounding you like a mighty amphitheatre on all sides, may be said to require and expect at your hands. Your whole education, in its last sense and purpose, centres here. In vain have you made yourselves familiar with science, or secured the accomplishments of art, if along with all you are not assisted to understand and govern yourselves. Your knowledge and art may serve indeed, without this, to make you important and give you power within certain limits. But, alas, what are all advantages which can be thus secured, even under the most favorable circumstances, for the man who carries still in his own bosom the spirit of a slave? What are wealth, and station, and credit, and power, in such case, but fetters and chains, by which the soul is only so much the more enslaved to the authority of a strange and tyrant law? On the other hand, let this inward liberty prevail, and its fruit is found to be universal freedom and universal strength. It can make even poverty to be rich, and adversity serenely strong; while it throws a new worth round every form of prosperity, and spreads a new charm over all that life may have of beauty or glory besides. Such freedom is in truth a victory at the same time over the world. The man who is truly master of himself, not in the way of Stoic apathy and pride, but by inward union with the Divine Law, can never be the slave of men. He is prepared, to the same extent, to brave all tyrannical authority, whether it spring from the many or the few, whether it be exercised by single handed pope or hydra headed mob. Let it be your ambition, and aim and endeavor, to be thus free. God has

not called you, and we have not trained you, to the spirit of bondage and fear.

With these counsels, and the prayer that you may be able to quit yourselves like men in the great battle of life, we now bid you an affectionate and solemn *Farewell.*